arXiv:hep-th/0402184v4 6 May 2004

Dynamics in Non-Globally-Hyperbolic Static Spacetimes III: Anti-de Sitter Spacetime

Akihiro Ishibashi[†] and Robert M. Wald[‡]

[†]*Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK*

[‡]*Enrico Fermi Institute and Department of Physics University of Chicago 5640 S. Ellis Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60637-1433, USA*

February 1, 2008

Abstract

In recent years, there has been considerable interest in theories formulated in anti-de Sitter (AdS) spacetime. However, AdS spacetime fails to be globally hyperbolic, so a classical field satisfying a hyperbolic wave equation on AdS spacetime need not have a well defined dynamics. Nevertheless, AdS spacetime is static, so the possible rules of dynamics for a field satisfying a linear wave equation are constrained by our previous general analysis—given in paper II—where it was shown that the possible choices of dynamics correspond to choices of positive, self-adjoint extensions of a certain differential operator, A. In the present paper, we reduce the analysis of electromagnetic, and gravitational perturbations in AdS spacetime to scalar wave equations. We then apply our general results to analyse the possible dynamics of scalar, electromagnetic, and gravitational perturbations in AdS spacetime. In AdS spacetime, the freedom (if any) in choosing self-adjoint extensions of A corresponds to the freedom (if any) in choosing suitable boundary conditions at infinity, so our analysis determines all of the possible boundary conditions that can be imposed at infinity. In particular, we show that other boundary conditions besides the Dirichlet and Neumann conditions may be possible, depending on the

value of the effective mass for scalar field perturbations, and depending on the number of spacetime dimensions and type of mode for electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations.

1 Introduction

Anti-de Sitter (AdS) spacetime[1] has come to play a central role in a number of contexts in theoretical physics [1], most prominently in the "AdS-CFT" correspondence [2, 3, 4] (see also e.g., [5] and references therein). Although AdS spacetime is maximally symmetric and geodesically complete, it admits no Cauchy surface and thus provides a very simple but nontrivial example of a non-globally-hyperbolic spacetime. Consequently, it is far from obvious, a priori, that one can define a sensible, deterministic field dynamics in AdS spacetime, even for classical, linear fields: If a classical field satisfies a linear hyperbolic equation, then it is locally uniquely determined by suitable initial data on a spacelike hypersurface; however, in order to guarantee that a solution corresponding to given initial data exists globally and is globally unique, it is essential that the spacetime be globally hyperbolic and that the data be specified on a Cauchy surface (see, e.g. [6]).

For the case of a scalar wave equation in AdS spacetime, it is clear that—at least for some values of mass and coupling to curvature—it is necessary to specify boundary conditions at infinity in order to obtain a well posed, deterministic evolution law. This issue has been investigated by a number of authors (see, in particular, [7, 8, 9]) and some proposals—such as Dirichlet or Neumann conditions—have been made. However, it is far from obvious that the boundary conditions that have been proposed encompass all the possibilities for dynamical evolution laws in AdS spacetime. New dynamical evolution laws would provide new "bulk theories" in AdS spacetime, and could be of interest in view of the AdS-CFT correspondence[2], among other reasons.

The purpose of this paper is to apply our general analysis of dynamics in static, non-globally-hyperbolic spacetimes [16] to systematically determine all possible boundary conditions that can be imposed at infinity for scalar, electromagnetic, and gravitational perturbations of AdS spacetime. In our previous paper [16], we proved that any dynamical evolution law for a scalar field in a static, stably causal spacetime that (i) locally agrees with the wave equation, (ii) admits a suitable conserved positive energy, (iii) is compatible with the time translation

[1] In this paper, by m-dimensional AdS spacetime of curvature radius ℓ, we mean the universal covering space of the hyperboloid composed of points whose squared distance from the origin is $-\ell^2$ in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ with a flat metric of signature $--+...+$.

[2] Some implications of different choices of boundary conditions for AdS-CFT correspondence have been discussed in [10, 11]. In particular, it was pointed out that multi-trace deformation of a boundary quantum field theory can be incorporated in the AdS-CFT correspondence by using a general boundary condition for the corresponding bulk field [12, 13] (see also [14, 15] and references therein).

and time reflection symmetries, and (iv) satisfies a certain convergence condition must correspond to a prescription of the type first proposed in [17]. Consequently, the general prescription for a dynamical evolution law for a scalar field in a static, stably causal spacetime arises as follows:

Let $(M, g_{\mu\nu})$ be a stably causal (but not necessarily globally hyperbolic) spacetime which admits a hypersurface orthogonal timelike Killing vector field, t^μ, whose orbits are complete. Let ϕ be a scalar field on $(M, g_{\mu\nu})$ which satisfies the Klein-Gordon equation

$$\nabla^\mu \nabla_\mu \phi - m_0^2 \phi = 0\,, \tag{1}$$

with ∇_μ being the derivative operator associated with the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. Since $(M, g_{\mu\nu})$ is static, the equation of motion (1) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\phi = -A\phi\,, \tag{2}$$

where t denotes the Killing parameter and

$$A = -VD^i(VD_i) + m_0^2 V^2\,, \tag{3}$$

where $V \equiv (-t^\mu t_\mu)^{1/2}$ and D_i is the derivative operator compatible with the induced metric defined on a spacelike hypersurface Σ orthogonal to the orbits of t^μ.

We can view A as an operator (with domain $C_0^\infty(\Sigma)$) on the Hilbert space, $L^2(\Sigma, V^{-1}d\Sigma)$, of square integrable functions on Σ with volume measure $V^{-1}d\Sigma$, where $d\Sigma$ denotes the natural volume element on Σ arising from the induced metric. Then, provided that $m_0^2 \geqslant 0$, A is a positive, symmetric operator on $L^2(\Sigma, V^{-1}d\Sigma)$. Hence, A always admits at least one positive self-adjoint extension—namely, the Friedrichs extension, A_F. Let A_E denote any positive self-adjoint extension of A. For any initial data $(\phi_0, \dot{\phi}_0) \in L^2(\Sigma, V^{-1}d\Sigma) \times L^2(\Sigma, V^{-1}d\Sigma)$, define ϕ_t by

$$\phi_t = \cos(A_E^{1/2}t)\phi_0 + A_E^{-1/2}\sin(A_E^{1/2}t)\dot{\phi}_0\,. \tag{4}$$

Then it was shown in [17] that whenever $(\phi_0, \dot{\phi}_0) \in C_0^\infty(\Sigma) \times C_0^\infty(\Sigma)$, the quantity ϕ_t defines a smooth solution of eq. (1) on all of M. Furthermore, this solution agrees with the solution determined by the initial data $(\phi_0, \dot{\phi}_0)$ within the domain of dependence of initial hypersurface Σ. In addition, these solutions have a conserved, positive energy $E = (\phi_t, A_E\phi_t)_{L^2} + (\dot{\phi}_t, \dot{\phi}_t)_{L^2}$, and satisfy properties (iii) and (iv) mentioned above.

As already stated, the main result proven in [16] was that the above prescription eq. (4) is the only possible way for defining dynamics, subject to requirements (i)-(iv). Hence, we have the following simple algorithm to systematically determine the possible boundary conditions at infinity for a scalar field in AdS

spacetime: (a) Write the equation of motion in the form (2), thereby identifying the operator A, eq. (3). (b) Determine all of the positive, self-adjoint extensions, A_E, of A. (c) Interpret the dynamics defined by eq. (4) in terms of boundary conditions at infinity. In the present paper, we shall carry out this procedure to completion.

The only property of A used in the above analysis is that it is a positive, symmetric, elliptic operator on a suitable L^2 Hilbert space. Therefore, the analysis of scalar field dynamics given in [17] and [16] can be generalised straightforwardly to second order, linear, hyperbolic equations satisfied by arbitrary tensor fields provided that in static spacetimes[3] these equations can still be put in the general form of eq. (2), with A a positive, symmetric, elliptic operator. In particular, it can be applied to Maxwell's equations and the linearised Einstein equation provided that these equations have been put in the form eq. (2). However, it is not straightforward to put Maxwell's equations or the linearised Einstein equation in the required form. For example, although Maxwell's equations for the vector potential, A_μ, in the Lorentz gauge have the desired second order, hyperbolic form, the "inner product" needed to make the corresponding A symmetric is not positive definite, since it yields a negative contribution from the time component, A_0, of A_μ. In Minkowski spacetime, one may set $A_0 = 0$ by a further gauge choice, but such a choice is not possible in a general curved spacetime. Similar remarks apply to the linearised Einstein equation in the transverse traceless gauge.

In this paper, we shall analyse Maxwell's equations and the linearised Einstein equation in AdS spacetime by making use of the spherical symmetry of AdS spacetime to decompose the vector potential and metric perturbation into their "scalar", "vector", and "tensor" parts with respect to the rotation group. We will then expand each part in the appropriate spherical harmonics and will reduce the resulting equations to a collection of decoupled scalar wave equations in two dimensions, each of which is of the general form (2). In fact, we will show that each spherical harmonic component of the scalar wave equation (with arbitrary mass and curvature coupling), Maxwell's equation, and the linearised Einstein equation *all take exactly the same general form*, the only difference being the values of two parameters that appear in this equation. Therefore, we may determine the possible boundary conditions at infinity for scalar, electromagnetic, and gravitational perturbations of AdS spacetime by studying the self-adjoint extensions of a two parameter family of second order differential operators in one variable.

In our analysis, we shall consider $(n+2)$-dimensional AdS spacetime $(M, g_{\mu\nu})$ for all $n \geqslant 1$. (Our results also can be straightforwardly extended to $n = 0$ for the case of a scalar field.) We will work in a globally defined coordinate system

[3]The prescription of [17] has recently been generalised to stationary spacetimes [18]. However, no uniqueness results similar to those of [16] are presently known for the stationary case.

in which the metric takes the form

$$ds^2_{(n+2)} = \frac{\ell^2}{\sin^2 x}\left(-dt^2 + dx^2 + \cos^2 x \gamma_{ij} dz^i dz^j\right) , \tag{5}$$

where $\gamma_{ij}(z)dz^i dz^j$ is the metric of the n-dimensional round unit sphere S^n and ℓ denotes the curvature radius. The range of x is $(0, \pi/2]$ and the conformal boundary is located at $x = 0$. The coordinate vector field $\partial/\partial t$ is a globally timelike, hypersurface orthogonal Killing vector field[4]. By use of the spherical harmonic decomposition described in the previous paragraph, we will reduce the scalar wave equation, Maxwell's equation, and the linearised Einstein equation to wave equations in a 2-dimensional AdS spacetime

$$ds^2 = \frac{\ell^2}{\sin^2 x}\left(-dt^2 + dx^2\right) , \tag{6}$$

which is just the space of orbits (O^2, g_{ab}) of $(n+2)$-dimensional AdS spacetime under the rotation group $SO(n+1)$.

In the next section, we will perform the spherical harmonic decomposition of the equations of motion for scalar fields, electromagnetic fields and gravitational perturbations and show that they can be written in the form of a Klein-Gordon equation in 2-dimensional AdS spacetime. The analysis of self-adjoint extensions of the operator A appearing in this wave equation and the relation between self-adjoint extensions and boundary conditions at infinity are given in Section 3.

Notation and conventions

We will generally follow the notation and conventions of [6]. However, in this paper we will make frequent use of the above noted fact that $(n+2)$-dimensional AdS spacetime, $(M, g_{\mu\nu})$, can be expressed as a warped product of an n-dimensional round unit sphere, (S^n, γ_{ij}), and a 2-dimensional AdS spacetime, (O^2, g_{ab}). To distinguish between tensors on these different spaces, we will use greek indices to denote tensors on M, we will use latin indices in the range $a, b, \ldots, h$ to denote tensors on O^2, and we will use latin indices in the range $i, j, \ldots, p$ to denote

[4]The analysis of dynamics in this paper will be performed with respect to this globally timelike Killing field. There are other hypersurface orthogonal Killing fields in AdS spacetime that are timelike in a region that includes at least a portion of infinity. We believe that an analysis of dynamics with respect to these static Killing fields would give rise to precisely the same choices of boundary conditions, but we have not fully investigated this issue.

There have arisen some interests in implications of the topology for the AdS-CFT correspondence [19, 20, 21]. The simplest situation can be obtained by considering a quotient of AdS spacetime by a certain discrete subgroup of the group of the AdS isometries. We believe that an analysis of dynamics in such a geometry parallels the present analysis performed in the universal covering space.

tensors on S^n. When convenient, we will also use these indices to denote coordinates and coordinate components in these spaces. Thus, we may occasionally write equations like eq. (5) in the form

$$g_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu = g_{ab}(y)dy^a dy^b + r^2(y)\gamma(z)_{ij}dz^i dz^j\,, \tag{7}$$

where $r \equiv \ell\cos x/\sin x$.

We will denote the metric compatible derivative operators on $(M, g_{\mu\nu})$, (S^n, γ_{ij}), and (O^2, g_{ab}) by ∇_μ, D_i, and $\widehat{\nabla}_a$, respectively. In order to avoid introducing additional notation, we will also use γ_{ij} and D_i to denote the metric and derivative operator of the general Riemannian manifolds considered in the next section. In a few instances, we will need to introduce the derivative operator associated with the hypersurfaces, Σ, orthogonal to the static Killing field. In order to avoid introducing additional notation, we will also use D_i to denote this derivative operator (as we already did in eq. (3) above).

2 Field equations in anti-de Sitter spacetime

In this section, we will analyse the equations of motion for scalar, electromagnetic, and gravitational perturbations of AdS spacetime. Our analysis will be based on the decomposition of the modes of these fields into their scalar, vector, and tensor parts as well as the expansion of these parts in appropriate spherical harmonics. The desired general decomposition theorems are derived in the first subsection, and the spherical harmonic expansion is discussed in the second subsection. The explicit form of the scalar, electromagnetic, and gravitational perturbation equations in AdS spacetime are then derived in the final subsection. Most of the results of subsections 2.1 and 2.2 are well known and are given in many references (see, e.g., [22, 23, 24]), but complete derivations/proofs have not usually been provided in these other references.

2.1 Decomposition of Vectors and Symmetric Tensors on Compact Manifolds

We begin by recalling some general results on elliptic operators on compact manifolds. Let $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma_{ij})$ be a compact Riemannian manifold. Let P be a differential operator of order m (with smooth coefficients) mapping tensor fields of type (k, l) on $\mathcal{M}$ to tensor fields of the same type on $\mathcal{M}$. Thus, P has the explicit form

$$P = P^{i_1\ldots i_k}{}_{j_1\ldots j_l\, m_1\ldots m_k}{}^{n_1\ldots n_l\, p_1\ldots p_m} D_{p_1}\ldots D_{p_m} + \text{lower order terms} \tag{8}$$

where D_i denotes the derivative operator associated with γ_{ij}. For each $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and each covector k_i at x, the symbol, $\sigma_P(x, k)$, of P is defined as the following map from tensors of type (k, l) at x to tensors of type (k, l) at x

$$\sigma_P(x, k) = P^{i_1\ldots i_k}{}_{j_1\ldots j_l\, m_1\ldots m_k}{}^{n_1\ldots n_l\, p_1\ldots p_m} k_{p_1}\ldots k_{p_m}\,. \tag{9}$$

The operator P is said to be *elliptic* if the map $\sigma_P(x,k)$ is invertible for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $k_i \neq 0$. A well known result (usually referred to as "elliptic regularity") states the following: Let P be elliptic and let j be a smooth tensor field of type (k,l) (where here and in the following we will generally suppress all indices). Let u be a distributional tensor field of type (k,l) which satisfies the equation

$$Pu = j \tag{10}$$

in the distributional sense. Then u is smooth.

We can use the metric, γ_{ij} to define a natural L^2 inner product on (complex) tensor fields of type (k,l) on $\mathcal{M}$ via

$$(u,w)_{L^2} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} u^{*i_1\ldots i_k}{}_{j_1\ldots j_l} w_{i_1\ldots i_k}{}^{j_1\ldots j_l}\,, \tag{11}$$

where the star denotes complex conjugation. (In this equation indices are raised and lowered with γ_{ij} and the integration is with respect to the volume element associated with γ_{ij}.) We may view any differential operator, P, as an operator on L^2, defined on the dense domain of smooth tensor fields. Now let P be an elliptic operator on $\mathcal{M}$ that is symmetric when viewed as an operator on L^2, i.e., for all smooth u and w

$$(u, Pw) = (Pu, w)\,. \tag{12}$$

As will be discussed further in subsection 3.1 below, the self-adjoint extensions of P are determined by the "deficiency subspaces", i.e., the vectors $z_\pm$ in L^2 that satisfy

$$P^* z_\pm = \pm i z_\pm\,, \tag{13}$$

where P^* denotes the adjoint of P. However, eq. (13) implies that $z_\pm$ satisfies the equation $(P \mp i)z_\pm = 0$ in the distributional sense, so by elliptic regularity $z_\pm$ must be smooth. Hence, $z_\pm$ lies in the domain of P, and we may replace P^* by P in eq. (13). Taking the inner product of this equation with $z_\pm$, we immediately obtain a contradiction unless $z_\pm = 0$. Consequently, the deficiency subspaces are always trivial, and any symmetric, elliptic operator on a compact manifold is always essentially self-adjoint, i.e., it has a unique self-adjoint extension. Thus, the usually difficult analysis of determining whether a symmetric operator admits self-adjoint extensions and of characterising the self-adjoint extensions that do exist (see section 3 below) is always trivial for elliptic operators on a compact manifold.

Now let P be any symmetric, elliptic operator on $\mathcal{M}$ that is bounded from below as an operator on L^2. By the previous remarks, P has a unique self-adjoint extension, which we shall also denote by P. The operator $\exp(-sP)$ can

be then defined by the spectral theorem, and, for $s > 0$, it is a bounded self-adjoint operator. Since $P\exp(-sP)$ also is bounded operator on L^2, it follows that $\exp(-sP)$ also is a bounded map from L^2 into the mth Sobolev space, H_m of $\mathcal{M}$, where m is the order of P. Since the embedding of H_m into L^2 is a compact map when $\mathcal{M}$ is compact (see, e.g., [25]), it follows that $\exp(-sP)$ is a compact, self-adjoint operator on L^2. Hence, by the Hilbert-Schmidt theorem [26], it admits an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors, with eigenvalues converging to zero. It follows immediately that P itself has a purely discrete spectrum, and that all of the eigensubspaces of P are finite dimensional. Note also that by elliptic regularity, all eigenvectors of P are smooth tensor fields. Consequently, an equation of the form (10) will admit a solution if and only if j is orthogonal to $\ker P$, where $\ker P$ is the subspace of solutions to $Pz = 0$. Furthermore, if a solution to (10) exists, it obviously is unique up to addition of vectors in $\ker P$. As already stated above, we have $\dim(\ker P) < \infty$.

We now are ready to state our two decomposition results. The first one is essentially a simple case of the Hodge decomposition theorem for differential forms.

Proposition 2.1: Let $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma_{ij})$ be a compact Riemannian manifold. Then any dual vector field, v_i on $\mathcal{M}$ can be uniquely decomposed as

$$v_i = V_i + D_i S \tag{14}$$

where $D^i V_i = 0$. We refer to V_i and S, respectively, as the vector and scalar components of v_i.

Proof: If the decomposition exists, then S would have to satisfy

$$D^i D_i S = D^i v_i \,. \tag{15}$$

Since $P = -D^i D_i$ is a positive elliptic operator, we can solve this equation for S if and only if the "source term" on the right side is orthogonal to $\ker P$. However, $\ker P$ consists of only constant functions and since $\int_{\mathcal{M}} D^i v_i = 0$, the source is indeed orthogonal to $\ker P$. Hence, we obtain a solution S, which is unique up to the addition of a constant. We obtain the desired decomposition by defining $V_i = v_i - D_i S$. This decomposition is clearly unique, since the only ambiguity in S is the addition of a constant, which does not affect the decomposition. □

The second proposition concerns the decomposition of symmetric, second rank tensor fields.

Proposition 2.2: Let $(\mathcal{M}, \gamma_{ij})$ be a compact Riemannian Einstein space, i.e., $R_{ij} = c\gamma_{ij}$ for some constant c. Then any second rank symmetric tensor field, t_{ij} on $\mathcal{M}$ can be uniquely decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} t_{ij} &= T_{ij} \\ &\quad + D_{(i} V_{j)} \end{aligned}$$

$$+\left(D_iD_j-\frac{1}{n}\gamma_{ij}D^mD_m\right)S+\frac{1}{n}\gamma_{ij}t^m{}_m\,, \tag{16}$$

where $D^iT_{ij}=0$, $T^i{}_i=0$, and $D^iV_i=0$. We refer to T_{ij}, V_i, and $(S,t^m{}_m)$, respectively, as the tensor-, vector- and scalar-type components of t_{ij}.

Proof: We define

$$J_{ij} \equiv t_{ij}-\frac{1}{n}\gamma_{ij}t^m{}_m\,, \tag{17}$$

$$J_j \equiv D^iJ_{ij}\,, \tag{18}$$

$$J \equiv D^iJ_i=D^iD^jJ_{ij}\,. \tag{19}$$

Consider the equation

$$\left(D^iD_i+\frac{n}{n-1}c\right)W=\frac{n}{n-1}J\,. \tag{20}$$

This equation can be solved for W if and only if the source J is orthogonal to the solutions to

$$\left(D^iD_i+\frac{n}{n-1}c\right)U=0\,. \tag{21}$$

Taking the derivative of this equation and using $R_{ij}=c\gamma_{ij}$, we find

$$\left(D^iD_i+\frac{1}{n-1}c\right)D_jU=0\,. \tag{22}$$

Contracting with D^jU and integrating over $\mathcal{M}$, we find that any solution, U, to eq. (21) must also satisfy

$$D_iD_jU-\frac{1}{n}\gamma_{ij}D^mD_mU=0\,. \tag{23}$$

i.e., D^iU must be a conformal Killing field. It is easily checked that any solution, U, to eq. (23) is automatically orthogonal to J, so eq. (20) always can be solved for W. If $c\neq 0$, integration of eq. (20) yields $\int_{\mathcal{M}}W=0$. If $c=0$, then $U=$ const solves (21), so we can always choose the solution W to eq. (20) to satisfy $\int_{\mathcal{M}}W=0$. Therefore, in all cases, we can solve the equation

$$D^iD_iS=W \tag{24}$$

to obtain S.

Next, we consider the equation

$$D^iD_{(i}V_{j)}=J_j-\frac{n-1}{n}D_jW-cD_jS\,. \tag{25}$$

Again, the left side is a symmetric elliptic operator on dual vector fields, so we can solve eq. (25) provided that the right side is orthogonal to the kernel of this operator. However, it is easily seen that the kernel consists precisely of Killing vector fields and that the right side is orthogonal to any Killing vector field. Thus, we can always solve eq. (25) to obtain V_j. Furthermore, taking the divergence of eq. (25), we find

$$D^j D^i D_{(i} V_{j)} = J - \frac{n-1}{n} D^j D_j W - c D^j D_j S = 0 \tag{26}$$

and hence

$$\left(D^i D_i + c\right) D^j V_j = 0\,. \tag{27}$$

Taking the gradient of this equation, we find

$$(D^i D_i) D_m (D^j V_j) = 0 \tag{28}$$

which implies that $D_i D_m D^j V_j = 0$. In particular, we have $D^i D_i (D^j V_j) = 0$, which implies that $D^j V_j$ is constant. However, since $\int_{\mathcal{M}} D^j V_j = 0$, we obtain the desired result that $D^j V_j = 0$.

Having now defined S and V_j, we simply define T_{ij} by eq. (16). It is then easily verified that $T^i{}_i = 0$ and that $D^i T_{ij} = 0$. Finally, uniqueness of the decomposition follows from the fact that each of the 4 terms in eq. (16) are manifestly orthogonal in the L^2 inner product. Consequently, if there were two distinct ways of writing the decomposition (16) of t_{ij}, their difference would yield a formula for the zero-vector, expressing it as the sum of 4 orthogonal vectors, not all of which are zero. □

Finally, we note that compactness of $\mathcal{M}$ was used in the arguments of this subsection in the following two essential ways: (1) to argue that any symmetric elliptic operator is essentially self-adjoint, and (2) to argue that the spectrum of any self-adjoint elliptic operator is discrete. The symmetric, elliptic operators considered in the above propositions will be essentially self-adjoint on many non-compact manifolds of interest, but their spectra typically will be continuous. Consequently, although analogous decomposition results should hold for many non-compact manifolds, it will not be possible to give such a simple, general proof, i.e., the decomposition results for non-compact manifolds must be analysed on a case-by-case basis.

2.2 Spherical Harmonic Decomposition on an n-Sphere

Proposition 2.1 of the previous subsection holds for arbitrary compact Riemannian manifolds, and Proposition 2.2 holds for arbitrary compact Riemannian Einstein spaces. However, on general spaces, an operator of interest may "mix" the various components of vectors and tensors, e.g., when acting on the purely

"tensor part" of a symmetric rank-two tensor field, the resulting tensor field could have scalar and vector components. However, we shall see below that such "mixing" cannot occur on the (round) n-sphere for any operator that is rotationally invariant (and, in the case of the 2-sphere, also parity invariant). Consequently, the decompositions of the previous subsection are particularly useful in this case, since one can then analyse the scalar, vector, and tensor components separately. The purpose of this subsection is to establish this result as well as to introduce the spherical harmonic expansion of each component.

Let γ_{ij} be the round metric on the n-sphere, S^n. Then (S^n, γ_{ij}) is an Einstein space with $c = n - 1$, so, in particular, Proposition 2.2 applies. Consider, first, the scalar spherical harmonics. The rotation group $SO(n+1)$ acts naturally on the Hilbert space L^2_S of square integrable functions $f : S^n \to \mathbb{C}$. Since the Laplacian, D^iD_i, is invariant under rotations, each eigensubspace of D^iD_i must also be invariant under rotations. The scalar spherical harmonics, $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}_S}$ are defined to be an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of D^iD_i, i.e.,

$$\left(D^iD_i + k_S^2\right)\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}_S} = 0\,, \tag{29}$$

and

$$\int_{S^n} \mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}_S}\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}'_S} \;\; = \;\; \delta_{\mathbf{k}_S,\mathbf{k}'_S}\,. \tag{30}$$

An explicit choice of $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}_S}$ can be found in e.g., [27] and references therein. The eigenvalues k_S^2 appearing in eq. (29) are $k_S^2 = l(l+n-1),\ l = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.

The rotation group also acts naturally on the Hilbert space of square integrable vector fields on S^n. In addition, it is easily seen that rotations map the Hilbert subspace, L^2_V, of divergence-free vector fields into itself. Furthermore, it is easily checked that the Laplacian, D^iD_i, also maps L^2_V into itself. Vector spherical harmonics, $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}_V i}$, are defined to be an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of D^iD_i in L^2_V, i.e., they satisfy

$$(D^jD_j + k_V^2)\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}_V i} = 0\,, \quad D^i\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}_V i} = 0\,, \tag{31}$$

and

$$\int_{S^n} \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}_V i}\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}'_V}{}^{i} \;\; = \;\; \delta_{\mathbf{k}_V,\mathbf{k}'_V}\,. \tag{32}$$

An explicit choice of $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}_V i}$ can be found in e.g., [27] and references therein. The eigenvalues k_V^2 appearing in eq. (32) are $k_V^2 = l(l+n-1) - 1,\ l = 1, 2, \ldots$. The number of the independent components of $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}_V i}$ is $(n-1)$, so vector spherical harmonics are nontrivial only when $n \geqslant 2$.

Finally, the rotation group also acts naturally on the Hilbert space of square integrable rank-two symmetric tensor fields on S^n. In addition, it is easily seen

that it maps the Hilbert subspace, L^2_T, of trace-free, divergence-free symmetric tensor fields into itself. Furthermore, it is easily checked that the Laplacian, D^iD_i, also maps L^2_T into itself. Tensor spherical harmonics, $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}_T ij}$ are defined to be an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of D^iD_i in L^2_T, i.e., they satisfy

$$(D^mD_m + k^2_T)\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}_T ij} = 0\,, \quad D_j\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}_T}{}^j{}_i = 0\,, \quad \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}_T}{}^i{}_i = 0\,, \tag{33}$$

and

$$\int_{S^n} \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}_T ij}\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}'_T}{}^{ij} \;\; = \;\; \delta_{\mathbf{k}_T,\mathbf{k}'_T}\,. \tag{34}$$

An explicit choice of $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}_T ij}$ can be found in Ref. [27]. The eigenvalues k^2_T appearing in eq. (33) are $k^2_T = l(l+n-1) - 2$, $l = 2, 3, \ldots$. The number of the independent components of $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}_T ij}$ is $(n-2)(n+1)/2$, so, in particular, tensor spherical harmonics are nontrivial only when $n \geqslant 3$.

The "total squared angular momentum", J^2, is the Casimir element of the universal enveloping algebra of the Lie algebra of $SO(n+1)$ obtained by summing the squares of the elements of an orthonormal basis, $\{\xi_{(\alpha)}\}$, of the Lie algebra. For tensor fields on S^n, the action of J^2 is obtained by replacing each $\xi_{(\alpha)}$ by the Lie derivative with respect to the corresponding Killing vector field on S^n. The action of J^2 on scalar functions on S^n is thereby computed to be simply

$$J^2_S = -D^iD_i\,. \tag{35}$$

Similarly, the action of J^2 on dual vector fields and on rank-two symmetric tensor fields on S^n are, respectively,

$$(J^2_V)_i{}^j = -(D^mD_m - (n-1))\delta_i{}^j\,, \tag{36}$$

and

$$(J^2_T)_{ij}{}^{kl} = -(D^mD_m - 2n)\delta_i{}^k\delta_j{}^l - 2\gamma_{ij}\gamma^{kl}\,. \tag{37}$$

Consequently, for scalar spherical harmonics of order l, J^2 takes the value $l(l+n-1)$; for vector spherical harmonics of order l, J^2 takes the value $l(l+n-1)+(n-2)$; and for tensor spherical harmonics of order l, J^2 takes the value $l(l+n-1)+2(n-1)$. By inspection, the values of J^2 for scalar, vector, and tensor harmonics never are equal, except for the case $n = 2$, when the values of J^2 for scalar and vector spherical harmonics agree for all l. Thus—except in the case $n = 2$—the scalar, vector, and tensor harmonics always span inequivalent representations of the rotation group. This implies that there cannot exist any (nonzero) rotationally invariant map between any pair of the spaces L^2_T and L^2_V and L^2_S—with the exception of the case $n = 2$, where there could exist a rotationally invariant map between L^2_V and L^2_S (see below). In particular, this

means that any rotationally invariant operator on rank-two symmetric tensor fields on S^n cannot take the tensor component into a nonzero vector or scalar component; it cannot take the vector component into a nonzero tensor component or (if $n > 2$) a nonzero scalar component; nor can it take the scalar component into a nonzero tensor component or (if $n > 2$) a non-zero vector component.

When $n = 2$ the scalar and vector harmonics span equivalent representations of $SO(3)$ and, indeed, the vector harmonics can be chosen to be

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}i} \equiv \epsilon_{ij} D^j \mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}} \,, \tag{38}$$

where ϵ_{ij} is the (positively oriented) volume element on S^2 associated with γ_{ij}. Thus, one sees explicitly that there exist nonvanishing $SO(3)$-invariant maps between L^2_V and L^2_S. However, as can be seen from eq. (38), the vector and scalar harmonics behave differently under parity, and thus span inequivalent representations of $O(3)$. (The scalar representations of $O(3)$ are said to be of "polar" (or "even parity") type, and the vector representations are said to be of "axial" (or "odd parity") type.) Consequently, even when $n = 2$, no rotationally *and* parity invariant operator can "mix" the scalar and vector components of a vector field or symmetric, rank-two tensor field.

2.3 Scalar fields on AdS Spacetime

We now turn our attention to the derivation of the desired form of the field equations for scalar, electromagnetic, and gravitational perturbations of AdS spacetime. As previously noted, the metric (5) of $(n+2)$-dimensional AdS spacetime takes the form of a warped product of an n-dimensional base space (S^n, γ_{ij}) and a 2-dimensional space of orbits (O^2, g_{ab}):

$$ds^2_{(n+2)} = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu = g_{ab}(y) dy^a dy^b + r^2(y) \gamma(z)_{ij} dz^i dz^j \,, \tag{39}$$

where γ_{ij} is the round, unit sphere metric on S^n, and

$$r \equiv \ell \frac{\cos x}{\sin x} \,. \tag{40}$$

In the coordinates (t, r) the metric of the space of orbits takes the form

$$g_{ab}(y) dy^a dy^b = -V^2 \ell^2 dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{V^2} \,, \quad V^2 = 1 + \frac{r^2}{\ell^2} \,. \tag{41}$$

Our general strategy will be to project all tensor fields into parts that are tangent and orthogonal to S^n, to decompose all tensor fields on S^n into their scalar, vector, and tensor components, and to expand each component on S^n in the appropriate spherical harmonics.

To avoid confusion when comparing with other analyses, it should be emphasised that our analysis involves an "$n+2$" decomposition of AdS spacetime rather

than an "$(n+1)+1$" decomposition. Thus, for example, our notion of the scalar, vector, and tensor components of a metric perturbation are defined with respect to the action of the isometry subgroup $SO(n+1)$, whose orbits are n-spheres. It would also be possible to write AdS spacetime as a Robertson-Walker spacetime and decompose tensors with respect to the isometry subgroup acting on the $(n+1)$-dimensional surfaces of homogeneity and isotropy in the manner done, e.g., in [22, 23]. This would give rise to completely different notions of the scalar, vector, and tensor components of a metric perturbation.

The simplest case is that of a Klein-Gordon scalar field, ϕ, where no projections are necessary. We expand ϕ in terms of scalar spherical harmonics $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(z^i)$

$$\phi(t,x,z^i) \equiv r^{-n/2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_S} \Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(t,r)\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}}(z^i)\,. \tag{42}$$

The equation of motion for each $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(t,r)$ is obtained by straightforward substitution into (1). Returning to the original coordinates (t,x), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\Phi = \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\nu^2-1/4}{\sin^2 x} - \frac{\sigma^2-1/4}{\cos^2 x}\right)\Phi\,, \tag{43}$$

where the index $\mathbf{k}$ labelling the harmonics has been omitted. Here the constants ν and σ in the effective potential term are given by

$$\nu^2 - \frac{1}{4} = \frac{n(n+2)}{4} + m_0^2\ell^2\,, \tag{44}$$

and

$$\sigma^2 - \frac{1}{4} = l(l+n-1) + \frac{n(n-2)}{4}\,. \tag{45}$$

Since the scalar curvature, $R = -(n+1)(n+2)\ell^{-2}$, is constant in AdS spacetime, the modification to eq. (1) resulting from the addition of the curvature coupling term $-\xi R$ is equivalent to changing the mass by $m_0^2 \to m^2$, where the effective mass, m^2, is defined by

$$m^2 \equiv m_0^2 - \xi(n+1)(n+2)\ell^{-2}\,. \tag{46}$$

Note that for the case of a conformally coupled scalar field (i.e., $m_0^2 = 0$ and $\xi = n/4(n+1)$), we have

$$\nu^2 = \frac{1}{4}\,. \tag{47}$$

2.4 Electromagnetic fields

Maxwell's equations for the electromagnetic field tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$ are

$$\nabla_\nu F^{\nu\mu} = 0\,, \tag{48}$$

$$\nabla_{[\sigma} F_{\mu\nu]} = 0\,. \tag{49}$$

Since AdS spacetime is topologically trivial the second equation (49) immediately implies the existence of a vector potential A_μ, so that

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu A_\nu - \nabla_\nu A_\mu\,. \tag{50}$$

Equation (50) is the general solution to eq. (49).

We may write A_μ as the sum of its projection orthogonal to S^n and its projection tangent to S^n. The components of A_μ orthogonal to S^n behave as scalars under rotations of S^n. The projection of A_μ tangent to S^n can then be decomposed into its scalar and vector parts in accordance with Proposition 2.1. Maxwell's equations are invariant under rotations and parity transformations, and hence cannot couple the vector and scalar parts of A_μ. Therefore, we may treat these cases separately.

In order to express Maxwell equation (48) explicitly, it is useful to write down the non-vanishing components of the Christoffel symbol ${\Gamma^\mu}_{\nu\lambda}$ associated with $g_{\mu\nu}$,

$${\Gamma^a}_{bc} = {\widehat{\Gamma}^a}_{bc}\,, \quad {\Gamma^a}_{ij} = -r\widehat{\nabla}^a r\gamma_{ij}\,, \quad {\Gamma^i}_{aj} = \frac{\widehat{\nabla}_a r}{r}{\delta^i}_j\,, \quad {\Gamma^i}_{jk} = {\hat{\Gamma}^i}_{jk}\,, \tag{51}$$

where ${\widehat{\Gamma}^a}_{bc}$ and ${\hat{\Gamma}^i}_{jk}$ are the components of the Christoffel symbols associated with the metrics g_{ab} and γ_{ij}, respectively.

Vector-type component

The purely vector part, A^V_μ, of A_μ can be expanded in vector spherical harmonics as

$$A^V_\mu dx^\mu = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_V} \phi_{V\mathbf{k}} \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}i} dz^i\,. \tag{52}$$

Since the gauge freedom in A_μ is purely scalar, it follows that A^V_μ—and hence each $\phi_{V\mathbf{k}}$—is gauge-invariant. Substituting eq. (52) into eq. (48), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{r^{n-2}}\widehat{\nabla}_c(r^{n-2}\widehat{\nabla}^c\phi_V) - \frac{k_V^2 + (n-1)}{r^2}\phi_V = 0\,, \tag{53}$$

where we have omitted the index $\mathbf{k}$ here and in the following. In terms of the rescaled variable $\Phi_V \equiv r^{(n-2)/2}\phi_V$, we obtain

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a\widehat{\nabla}_a\Phi_V - \frac{n-2}{2}\left\{\frac{\widehat{\nabla}^a\widehat{\nabla}_a r}{r} + \frac{n-4}{2}\frac{(\widehat{\nabla}^c r)\widehat{\nabla}_c r}{r^2}\right\}\Phi_V - \frac{k_V^2 + (n-1)}{r^2}\Phi_V = 0\,. \tag{54}$$

We can easily check that the a-components of eq. (48) provide just a trivial equation, as they must since they are scalar components of Maxwell's equations.

Substituting $\widehat{\nabla}^a\widehat{\nabla}_a r/r = 2/\ell^2$ and $(\widehat{\nabla}^c r)\widehat{\nabla}_c r/r^2 = 1/\ell^2 + 1/r^2$ into eq. (54) we obtain

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a\widehat{\nabla}_a\Phi_V - \left\{\frac{n(n-2)}{4}\frac{1}{\ell^2} + \left[\frac{n(n-2)}{4} + l(l+n-1)\right]\frac{1}{r^2}\right\}\Phi_V = 0\,. \tag{55}$$

In terms of the original coordinates (t, x), eq. (55) takes exactly the same form as eq. (43), with

$$\nu^2 \;=\; \frac{n(n-2)}{4} + \frac{1}{4}\,, \tag{56}$$

and with σ^2 again given by eq. (45).

Scalar-type component

The scalar part, A^S_μ, of A_μ, consists of two quantities: a vector, A_a, orthogonal to S^n and the scalar component, A, of a vector tangent to S^n (see Proposition 2.1). We may expand both of these quantities in scalar spherical harmonics $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}}$,

$$A^S_\mu dx^\mu = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_S}\left(A_{\mathbf{k}a}\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}}dy^a + A_{\mathbf{k}}D_i\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}}dz^i\right)\,, \tag{57}$$

The contribution of each spherical harmonic component to the field strength is given by

$$F_{ab} = (\widehat{\nabla}_a A_b - \widehat{\nabla}_b A_a)\mathbb{S}\,, \tag{58}$$

$$F_{ai} = (\widehat{\nabla}_a A + k_S A_a)D_i\mathbb{S}\,, \tag{59}$$

$$F_{ij} = 0\,, \tag{60}$$

where we have again omitted writing the index $\mathbf{k}$. The i-components of eq. (48) then take the form

$$\widehat{\nabla}_a\left\{r^{n-2}\left(\widehat{\nabla}^a A + k_S A^a\right)\right\} = 0\,. \tag{61}$$

This immediately implies that there exists a scalar field ϕ_S such that

$$\widehat{\nabla}_a\phi_S = \epsilon_{ab}r^{n-2}(\widehat{\nabla}^b A + k_S A^b)\,, \tag{62}$$

where ϵ_{ab} is the metric compatible volume element on (O^2, g_{ab}). Since ϕ_S is related to the field strength via eq. (59) as

$$F_{ai} = \frac{1}{r^{n-2}}\epsilon_{ab}\widehat{\nabla}^b\phi_S D_i\mathbb{S}\,, \tag{63}$$

gauge freedom of ϕ_S is restricted to only the replacement

$$\phi_S \to \phi_S + \text{const}\,. \tag{64}$$

In terms of ϕ_S, the a-components of eq. (48) are written as

$$\widehat{\nabla}_b \left[r^n \widehat{\nabla}_a \left(\frac{1}{r^{n-2}} \widehat{\nabla}^a \phi_S \right) - k_S^2 \phi_S \right] = 0\,. \tag{65}$$

So, we have

$$r^{n-2} \widehat{\nabla}_a \left(\frac{1}{r^{n-2}} \widehat{\nabla}^a \phi_S \right) - \frac{k_S^2}{r^2} \phi_S = \frac{c}{r^2}\,. \tag{66}$$

Since the integration constant c in the right hand side of this equation can always be absorbed in ϕ_S by using the remaining gauge freedom (64), we have the following equation of motion for the now gauge-invariant variable ϕ_S,

$$r^{n-2} \widehat{\nabla}_a \left(\frac{1}{r^{n-2}} \widehat{\nabla}^a \phi_S \right) - \frac{k_S^2}{r^2} \phi_S = 0\,. \tag{67}$$

In terms of the rescaled variable $\Phi_S \equiv r^{-(n-2)/2} \phi_S$, we have

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a \Phi_S + \frac{n-2}{2} \left\{ \frac{\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a r}{r} - \frac{n}{2} \frac{(\widehat{\nabla}^c r) \widehat{\nabla}_c r}{r^2} \right\} \Phi_S - \frac{k_S^2}{r^2} \Phi_S = 0\,. \tag{68}$$

Again substituting $\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a r / r = 2/\ell^2$ and $(\widehat{\nabla}^c r) \widehat{\nabla}_c r / r^2 = 1/\ell^2 + 1/r^2$, we obtain

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a \Phi_S - \left\{ \frac{(n-2)(n-4)}{4} \frac{1}{\ell^2} + \left[\frac{n(n-2)}{4} + l(l+n-1) \right] \frac{1}{r^2} \right\} \Phi_S = 0\,. \tag{69}$$

In terms of the original coordinate system (t, x), this equation again takes the canonical form (43) with

$$\nu^2 \;=\; \frac{(n-2)(n-4)}{4} + \frac{1}{4}\,, \tag{70}$$

and σ^2 again given by eq. (45). Notice that in 4-dimensional AdS spacetime (i.e., $n = 2$), both vector- and scalar-type components of the electromagnetic field satisfy the same equation as a conformally invariant scalar field.

2.5 Gravitational perturbations

We shall basically follow the derivation of equations of motion for the master variables of gravitational perturbations developed in Ref. [28]. The resultant

equations are equivalent to those given in [29] in maximally symmetric backgrounds and those in [24, 30] in more general backgrounds.

Gravitational perturbations are described by a symmetric tensor field $h_{\mu\nu} = \delta g_{\mu\nu}$ on the background AdS spacetime. We may project $h_{\mu\nu}$ relative to S^n as

$$h_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu = h_{ab}dy^a dy^b + 2h_{ai}dy^a dz^i + h_{ij}dz^i dz^j \,. \tag{71}$$

The projection, h_{ab}, orthogonal to S^n in both indices is purely scalar with respect to rotations. The orthogonal-tangent projection, h_{ai}, and the tangent-tangent projection h_{ij} can be further decomposed into their scalar, vector, and tensor parts as

$$\begin{aligned} h_{ai} &= D_i h_a + {h^{(1)}}_{ai} \,, & (72)\\ h_{ij} &= {h^{(2)}}_{ij} \\ &\quad +2D_{(i}{h_T^{(1)}}_{j)} \\ &\quad +h_L\gamma_{ij} + \left(D_iD_j - \frac{1}{n}\gamma_{ij}D^mD_m\right) h_T^{(0)} \,, & (73) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$D^j {h^{(2)}}_{ij} = {h^{(2)i}}_i = 0 \,, \tag{74}$$

$$D^i {h^{(1)}}_{ai} = 0 \,, \quad D^i {h_T^{(1)}}_i = 0 \,. \tag{75}$$

Thus, the tensor part of $h_{\mu\nu}$ is ${h^{(2)}}_{ij}$, the vector part of $h_{\mu\nu}$ consists of $({h^{(1)}}_{ai}, {h_T^{(1)}}_j)$, and the scalar component of $h_{\mu\nu}$ consists of $(h_{ab}, h_L, h_T^{(0)})$. Each tensorial component decouples from the others and can be expanded in the appropriate tensor harmonics, namely $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}_T ij}$, $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}_V i}$, and $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}_S}$, respectively.

Tensor-type perturbation

We expand the tensor-type perturbation in spherical harmonics as,

$${h^{(2)}}_{ij} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_T} H_{T\mathbf{k}}^{(2)} \cdot \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{k}ij} \,, \tag{76}$$

with $H_T^{(2)}$ being a function on (O^2, g_{ab}). Since the gauge freedom

$$h_{\mu\nu} \to h_{\mu\nu} - \nabla_\mu \xi_\nu - \nabla_\nu \xi_\mu \,, \tag{77}$$

does not contain any tensor part, it is clear that $H_T^{(2)}$ is gauge-invariant. Writing $\Phi_T \equiv r^{-2+n/2} H_T^{(2)}$, we find that the linearised Einstein equations yield

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a \Phi_T - \left\{ \frac{n(n+2)}{4}\frac{1}{\ell^2} + \left[\frac{n(n-2)}{4} + l(l+n-1)\right]\frac{1}{r^2} \right\} \Phi_T = 0 \,. \tag{78}$$

This equation again takes the form (43) with ν^2 given by

$$\nu^2 = \frac{n(n+2)}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \,, \tag{79}$$

and σ^2 again given by eq. (45).

Vector-type perturbation

Vector-type components can be expanded in terms of vector spherical harmonics as

$$h^{(1)}{}_{ai} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_V} H^{(1)}_{\mathbf{k}}{}_a \cdot \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}i}\,, \tag{80}$$

$$h^{(1)}_T{}_j = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_V} H^{(1)}_{T\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{k}i}\,. \tag{81}$$

Note that, as shown in the Appendix, $l = 1$ modes do not correspond to dynamical perturbations, so hereafter we assume $l \geqslant 2$.

The vector component, $\xi^{(1)}\mathbb{V}_i dz^i$, of the gauge transformation eq. (77) yields

$$H^{(1)}{}_a \rightarrow H^{(1)}{}_a - r^2\widehat{\nabla}_a\left(\frac{\xi^{(1)}}{r^2}\right)\,, \tag{82}$$

$$H^{(1)}_T \rightarrow H^{(1)}_T - \xi^{(1)}\,. \tag{83}$$

It follows immediately that a natural gauge-invariant combination is given by

$$Z_a \equiv H^{(1)}{}_a - r^2\widehat{\nabla}_a\left(\frac{H^{(1)}_T}{r^2}\right)\,. \tag{84}$$

Substituting this into the linearised Einstein equations, we have

$$\widehat{\nabla}_a\left(r^{n-2}Z^a\right) = 0\,, \tag{85}$$

$$\frac{1}{r^n}\widehat{\nabla}^b\left[r^{n+2}\left\{\widehat{\nabla}_b\left(\frac{Z_a}{r^2}\right) - \widehat{\nabla}_a\left(\frac{Z_b}{r^2}\right)\right\}\right] - \frac{k_V^2-(n-1)}{r^2}Z_a = 0\,. \tag{86}$$

These equations have the same form as the i-components and a-components, respectively, of eq. (48) in the case of the scalar part of electromagnetic fields, with $\widehat{\nabla}_a A + k_S A_a$ replaced by Z_a. In parallel with the introduction of ϕ_S in the electromagnetic case (see eq. (61)), we find from eq. (85), that there exists a scalar potential ϕ_V such that

$$Z_a = \frac{1}{r^{n-2}}\epsilon_{ab}\widehat{\nabla}^b\phi_V\,. \tag{87}$$

Substituting this into equation (86), we obtain

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a\left[r^{n+2}\widehat{\nabla}_b\left(\frac{1}{r^n}\widehat{\nabla}^b\phi_V\right) - \{k_V^2-(n-1)\}\phi_V\right] = 0\,. \tag{88}$$

From this equation (after eliminating an integration constant using the degree of freedom $\phi_V \rightarrow \phi_V + \text{const.}$ as we have done in the electromagnetic field case), we obtain

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a\widehat{\nabla}_a\Phi_V - \left\{\frac{n(n-2)}{4}\frac{1}{\ell^2} + \left[\frac{n(n-2)}{4} + l(l+n-1)\right]\frac{1}{r^2}\right\}\Phi_V = 0\,, \tag{89}$$

where $\Phi_V \equiv r^{-n/2}\phi_V$. This equation again has the form (43) with ν^2 given by

$$\nu^2 = \frac{n(n-2)}{4} + \frac{1}{4}\,, \tag{90}$$

and σ^2 again given by eq. (45). Note that this equation is precisely the same as the vector-type of Maxwell's equations (55).

Scalar-type perturbation

The scalar components of $h_{\mu\nu}$ can be expanded in scalar spherical harmonics as follows:

$$h_{ab} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_S} {H^{(0)}_{\mathbf{k}}}_{ab} \cdot \mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}}\,, \tag{91}$$

$$h_a = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_S} {H^{(0)}_{\mathbf{k}}}_{a} \cdot \mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}}\,, \tag{92}$$

$$h_L = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_S} H^{(0)}_{L\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}}\,, \tag{93}$$

$$h^{(0)}_T = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_S} H^{(0)}_{T\mathbf{k}} \cdot \mathbb{S}_{\mathbf{k}}\,, \tag{94}$$

where each of the expansion coefficients, $({H^{(0)}}_{ab}, {H^{(0)}}_{a}, H^{(0)}_L, H^{(0)}_T)$ are functions on (O^2, g_{ab}).

Note that the $l = 0$ ($k_S^2 = 0$) mode preserves the spherical symmetry of the background and, by Birkhoff's theorem, cannot describe any dynamical degrees of freedom. For $l = 1$ ($k_S^2 = n$), the corresponding perturbations also do not describe any physical dynamical degrees of freedom, as we show in the Appendix. Hence, hereafter we consider only the $l \geqslant 2$ modes.

The scalar-type gauge transformation is generated by ${\xi^{(0)}}_a \mathbb{S} dy^a + \xi^{(0)} D_i \mathbb{S} dz^i$. Observing that the scalar-type components transform as

$${H^{(0)}}_{ab} \to {H^{(0)}}_{ab} - \widehat{\nabla}_a {\xi^{(0)}}_b - \widehat{\nabla}_b {\xi^{(0)}}_a\,, \tag{95}$$

$${H^{(0)}}_{a} \to {H^{(0)}}_{a} - {\xi^{(0)}}_a - r^2 \widehat{\nabla}_a \left(\frac{\xi^{(0)}}{r^2}\right)\,, \tag{96}$$

$$H^{(0)}_L \to H^{(0)}_L + \frac{2k_S^2}{n}\xi^{(0)} - 2r(\widehat{\nabla}^a r){\xi^{(0)}}_a\,, \tag{97}$$

$$H^{(0)}_T \to H^{(0)}_T - 2\xi^{(0)}\,, \tag{98}$$

one can check that the following combinations are gauge-invariant:

$$Z \equiv n r^{n-4}\left\{H^{(0)}_L + \frac{k_S^2}{n}H^{(0)}_T + 2r(\widehat{\nabla}^a r)X_a\right\}\,, \tag{99}$$

$$Z_{ab} \equiv r^{n-2}\left({H^{(0)}}_{ab} + \widehat{\nabla}_a X_b + \widehat{\nabla}_b X_a\right) + \frac{(n-1)}{n} Z g_{ab}\,, \tag{100}$$

where

$$X_a \equiv -H^{(0)}{}_a + \frac{1}{2} r^2 \widehat{\nabla}_a \left(\frac{H_T^{(0)}}{r^2} \right) , \tag{101}$$

which itself is gauge-dependent: $X_a \to X_a + \xi^{(0)}{}_a$.

The full set of linearised Einstein equations for the scalar-type perturbations are written out in eqs. (63)—(66) of Ref. [28], where one must substitute $F = r^{-n+2} Z/(2n)$ and $F_{ab} = r^{-n+2} Z_{ab} - \{(n-1)/n\} r^{-n+2} Z g_{ab}$ in order to express these equations in terms of the variables we have introduced here. The (a,i)-components and the traceless part of the (i,j)-components of the linearised Einstein equations yield

$$\widehat{\nabla}_b Z^b{}_a = \widehat{\nabla}_a Z^c{}_c \,, \tag{102}$$

$$Z^a{}_a = Z \,. \tag{103}$$

We will now show that the variable Z_{ab} (and, hence, by eq. (103), also the variable Z) can be replaced by a single scalar field, ϕ_S. To do so, we will want ϕ_S to satisfy

$$\left(\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a - \frac{2}{\ell^2} \right) \phi_S = Z^a{}_a \tag{104}$$

on the space of orbits (O^2, g_{ab}). However, (O^2, g_{ab}), of course, fails to be globally hyperbolic, and although the methods of this paper allow us to prove existence of solutions to the homogeneous equation with initial data in $L^2(\Sigma, V^{-1} d\Sigma)$, we cannot guarantee existence of solutions to the inhomogeneous equation with an arbitrary smooth source that might, in particular, fail to lie in $L^2(\Sigma, V^{-1} d\Sigma)$ at each time. Nevertheless, we can overcome this difficulty by noticing that $(O^2, -g_{ab})$ *is* a globally hyperbolic spacetime, as can be seen by inspection of eq. (6), recalling that the coordinate ranges of (x,t) are $-\infty < t < \infty$ and $0 < x \leqslant \pi/2$. Thus, we can solve eq. (104) for arbitrary smooth $Z^a{}_a$ by specifying arbitrary smooth "initial data" $(\phi_{S0}(t), (\partial \phi_{S0}/\partial x)(t))$ on a hypersurface $x = x_0$. Furthermore, we will specify this initial data so as to satisfy

$$t^b \left(\widehat{\nabla}_a \widehat{\nabla}_b - \frac{1}{\ell^2} g_{ab} \right) \phi_S = t^b Z_{ab} \tag{105}$$

on the initial data surface $x = x_0$, where t^a denotes the static Killing field $(\partial/\partial t)^a$. (The above equation yields a system of two linear ODE's in t for ϕ_{S0} and $\partial \phi_{S0}/\partial x$ and hence always can be solved.) Now define

$$T_{ab} = Z_{ab} - \left(\widehat{\nabla}_a \widehat{\nabla}_b - \frac{1}{\ell^2} g_{ab} \right) \phi_S \,. \tag{106}$$

Then T_{ab} is transverse and traceless on (O^2, g_{ab}), i.e.,

$$\widehat{\nabla}_b T^b{}_a = 0\,, \quad T^a{}_a = 0\,. \tag{107}$$

We define

$$v_a = T_{ab} t^b\,. \tag{108}$$

It follows immediately from the Killing's equation $\widehat{\nabla}_a t_b + \widehat{\nabla}_b t_a = 0$ and eq. (107) that

$$\widehat{\nabla}_a v^a = 0\,, \tag{109}$$

and, consequently, there exists a scalar field s such that

$$v^a = \epsilon^{ab} \widehat{\nabla}_b s\,. \tag{110}$$

By our above choice of initial data for ϕ_S, we have $v_a = 0$ at $x = x_0$, so $\widehat{\nabla}_b s = 0$ at $x = x_0$. By adding a constant to s if necessary, we therefore can ensure that on the "initial data surface" $x = x_0$ we have $s = 0$ and $\partial s/\partial x = 0$.

On the other hand, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\nabla}_a(\epsilon^{ab} v_b) &= \widehat{\nabla}_a(\epsilon^{ab} T_b{}^c t_c) \\
&= \widehat{\nabla}_a(\epsilon^{cb} T_b{}^a t_c) \\
&= \epsilon^{cb} T_b{}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a t_c \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{cb} T_b{}^a \epsilon_{ac} \epsilon^{de} \widehat{\nabla}_d t_e \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \delta^b{}_a T_b{}^a \epsilon^{de} \widehat{\nabla}_d t_e \\
&= 0\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

where we have used the fact that for any traceless tensor T_{ab} on (O^2, g_{ab}),

$$T^a{}_b \epsilon^{bc} = T^c{}_b \epsilon^{ba} \tag{112}$$

at the second line and the formula $\widehat{\nabla}_a t_c = -(1/2)\epsilon_{ac}\epsilon^{de}\widehat{\nabla}_d t_e$ for any Killing vector field t^a on (O^2, g_{ab}) at the fourth line. Substituting eq. (110) into eq. (111), we obtain

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a s = 0\,. \tag{113}$$

Consequently, by Cauchy evolution in x, we obtain $s = 0$ and, hence, $v_a = 0$ throughout (O^2, g_{ab}). However, using the formulae

$$g_{ab} = \frac{1}{V^2}(-t_a t_b + \epsilon_{ac}\epsilon_{bd} t^c t^d)\,, \tag{114}$$

$$\epsilon_{ab}\epsilon_{cd} t^d = t_a g_{bc} - t_b g_{ca}\,, \tag{115}$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} T_{ab} &= T_a{}^c g_{cb} \\ &= \frac{1}{V^2}\left(-T_a{}^c t_c t_b + T_d{}^c \epsilon_{ca}\epsilon_{be} t^d t^e\right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{V^2}\left(v_a t_b + v_b t_a - g_{ab} v_c t^c\right) \\ &= 0\,, \end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

where we have used eq. (114) at the second line and eq. (115) at the third line. This proves that we can express the gauge-invariant perturbation variable Z_{ab} as

$$Z_{ab} = \left(\widehat{\nabla}_a \widehat{\nabla}_b - \frac{1}{\ell^2} g_{ab}\right)\phi_S\,. \tag{117}$$

Note that the residual freedom of ϕ_S, which leaves Z_{ab} unchanged, is

$$\phi_S \to \phi_S + \phi_0\,, \quad \left(\widehat{\nabla}_a \widehat{\nabla}_b - \frac{1}{\ell^2} g_{ab}\right)\phi_0 = 0\,. \tag{118}$$

Substituting the expression (117) and eq. (103) into the (a,b)-components of the linearised Einstein equations given in Ref. [28], we obtain

$$\left(\widehat{\nabla}_a \widehat{\nabla}_b - \frac{1}{\ell^2} g_{ab}\right) E(\phi_S) = 0\,, \tag{119}$$

where

$$E(\phi_S) \equiv r^2\left(\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a - n\frac{\widehat{\nabla}^a r}{r}\widehat{\nabla}_a - \frac{k_S^2 - n}{r^2} + \frac{n-2}{\ell^2}\right)\phi_S\,. \tag{120}$$

Viewing eq. (119) as three differential equations for E, we find the general solution,

$$E_{sol} = c_1 r + V\left(c_2 \sin t + c_3 \cos t\right)\,, \tag{121}$$

where c_1, c_2, c_3 are arbitrary constants and $V = (-t^a t_a)^{1/2} = \sqrt{1 + r^2/\ell^2}$.

On the other hand, since eq. (118) is the same as eq. (119), the residual freedom ϕ_0 is also given by

$$\phi_0 = c_1' r + V\left(c_2' \sin t + c_3' \cos t\right)\,, \tag{122}$$

with arbitrary constants c_1', c_2', c_3'. Using these explicit forms of E_{sol} and ϕ_0, we see that under the change (118), $E(\phi_S)$ transforms as

$$\begin{aligned} E(\phi_S) &\to E(\phi_S + \phi_0) \\ &= E_{sol} - (k_S^2 - n)\phi_0 + n\frac{r^2}{\ell^2}\phi_0 - nr\left(1 + \frac{r^2}{\ell^2}\right)\partial_r \phi_0 \\ &= E_{sol} - (k_S^2 - n)\phi_0 - n c_1' r \\ &= c_1'' r + V\left(c_2'' \sin t + c_3'' \cos t\right)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{123}$$

where $c_1'' = c_1 - k_S^2 c_1'$ $c_2'' = c_2 - (k_S^2 - n)c_2'$ $c_3'' = c_3 - (k_S^2 - n)c_3'$. Thus, setting these arbitrary constants c_1'', c_2'', c_3'' zero, we can make $E(\phi_S + \phi_0)$ vanish. Therefore, from eq. (120), we obtain

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a \Phi_S - \left\{ \frac{(n-2)(n-4)}{4} \frac{1}{\ell^2} + \left[\frac{n(n-2)}{4} + l(l+n-1) \right] \frac{1}{r^2} \right\} \Phi_S = 0 \,, \quad (124)$$

where $\Phi_S \equiv r^{-n/2}(\phi_S + \phi_0)$.

Again, the equation for scalar-type gravitational perturbations takes the form (43) with ν^2 given by

$$\nu^2 = \frac{(n-2)(n-4)}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \,, \quad (125)$$

and σ^2 again given by eq. (45).

Thus, we have reduced the problem of solving the gravitational perturbation equations to solving the 3 scalar equations (78), (89), and (124) for Φ_T, Φ_V, and Φ_S, respectively. Note that the vector- and scalar-type gravitational perturbations in 4-dimensions (i.e., $n = 2$), and scalar-type perturbations in 6-dimensions (i.e., $n = 4$) satisfy the same equation as a conformally invariant scalar field, while in all dimensions the tensor-type gravitational perturbations satisfy the same equation as a minimally coupled massless scalar field.

Finally, we note that the tensor spherical harmonics have $(n-2)(n+1)/2$ independent components, the vector spherical harmonics have $(n-1)$ independent components, and the scalar spherical harmonics have 1 independent component. Thus, the total number of independent components is $(n+2)(n-1)/2$, which corresponds to the number of dynamical degrees of freedom for gravitational radiation in an $(n+2)$-dimensional spacetime.

3 Dynamics in anti-de Sitter spacetime

We have seen that the field equations for scalar fields, electromagnetic fields and gravitational perturbations can be reduced to a wave equation of the form

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\Phi = \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\nu^2 - 1/4}{\sin^2 x} - \frac{\sigma^2 - 1/4}{\cos^2 x} \right) \Phi \,, \quad (126)$$

which is defined on the interval $(0, \pi/2)$, where $x = \pi/2$ corresponds to the origin of spherical coordinates and $x = 0$ corresponds to infinity in AdS spacetime. In all cases, σ takes the value (see eq. (45))

$$\sigma = l + \frac{n-1}{2} \,. \quad (127)$$

On the other hand, the value of ν^2 depends upon the field and the type (i.e., scalar, vector, or tensor) of perturbation. For scalar fields, ν^2 can take any (positive or

negative) value, depending on the value of the effective mass, $m^2 \equiv m_0^2 + \xi R$, of the scalar field. For the electromagnetic and gravitational cases, the values of ν^2 are given by eqs. (56), (70), (79), (90), and (125) above. In this section, we will determine all of the possible boundary conditions that can be imposed at infinity ($x = 0$) so as to yield sensible dynamics for this equation.

3.1 The operator A and its properties

The general prescription of [17] for defining dynamics (see section 1 above) corresponds to viewing the differential operator

$$A \equiv -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{\nu^2 - 1/4}{\sin^2 x} + \frac{\sigma^2 - 1/4}{\cos^2 x}\,, \tag{128}$$

appearing in eq. (126) as an operator on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2([0, \pi/2], dx)$. Indeed, taking account of the field redefinition (42), it is easily seen that for each spherical harmonic, the inner product for $\phi(t, x, z^i)$ in $L^2(\Sigma, V^{-1}d\Sigma)$ corresponds to the inner product for $\Phi(t, x)$ defined on $\mathcal{H}$, i.e.,

$$\int_\Sigma \psi^* \phi \; V^{-1} d\Sigma = \int_0^{\pi/2} \Psi^* \Phi \; dx\,. \tag{129}$$

It is easily seen that, when defined on the natural domain $C_0^\infty(0, \pi/2)$, A is a symmetric operator. For later purposes, it will be useful to classify A according to the possible values of ν^2 as follows:

Case (i): $\nu^2 \geqslant 1$. This case occurs for scalar fields whose effective mass squared satisfies $m^2 \geqslant -(n+3)(n-1)/4\ell^2$. In particular, this case encompasses the minimally coupled massless scalar field in all dimensions. This case also encompasses the tensor-type of gravitational perturbations in all dimensions where they are defined (namely spacetime dimensions greater than or equal to 5, i.e., $n \geqslant 3$), the vector-type of electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations in spacetime dimensions greater than or equal to 5 (i.e., $n \geqslant 3$), and the scalar-type of electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations in spacetime dimensions greater than or equal to 7 (i.e., $n \geqslant 5$).

Case (ii): $0 < \nu^2 < 1$. This case occurs for scalar fields whose effective mass is in the range $-(n+1)^2/4\ell^2 < m^2 < -(n+3)(n-1)/4\ell^2$. (Note that in 4 spacetime dimensions, this relation becomes $-9/4\ell^2 < m^2 < -5/4\ell^2$, which corresponds to the case analysed by Breitenlohner and Freedman [8, 9].) In particular, this case encompasses the conformally invariant scalar field in all spacetime dimensions. This case also encompasses the vector-type of electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations in 4-spacetime dimensions (i.e., $n = 2$), and the scalar-type of electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations in 4- and 6-spacetime dimensions (i.e., $n = 2, 4$).

Case (iii): $\nu^2 = 0$. This case occurs for a scalar field whose effective mass squared takes the critical value $m_C^2 \equiv -(n+1)^2/4\ell^2$. It also occurs for scalar-type of electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations in 5-dimensional (i.e., $n = 3$) AdS spacetime.

Case (iv): $\nu^2 < 0$. This case occurs only for a scalar field whose effective mass satisfies $m^2 < -(n+1)^2/4\ell^2$.

The positivity properties of A are governed by the following proposition:

Proposition 3.1: If $\nu^2 \geqslant 0$ (i.e., in cases (i), (ii), and (iii) above), then A is a positive operator. On the other hand, if $\nu^2 < 0$ (i.e., in case (iv) above) then A is unbounded below.

Proof: Consider, first, the case $\nu^2 \geqslant 0$. Let ν denote the positive square root of ν^2 and write

$$G_\nu(x) \equiv (\cos x)^{\sigma+1/2} \cdot (\sin x)^{-\nu+1/2} \,. \tag{130}$$

We define the operators $\tilde{D}^\pm$ by

$$\tilde{D}^\pm \equiv \pm\frac{d}{dx} - {G_\nu}^{-1}\frac{dG_\nu}{dx} \,, \tag{131}$$

Then A can be expressed as

$$A = \tilde{D}^-\tilde{D}^+ + (-\nu+\sigma+1)^2 \,. \tag{132}$$

For arbitrary $\Phi \in \mathrm{Dom}(A) = C_0^\infty(0, \pi/2)$, it is then easily seen that

$$(\Phi, A\Phi)_{L^2} = (-\nu+\sigma+1)^2 \int_0^{\pi/2} |\Phi|^2 dx + \int_0^{\pi/2} |\tilde{D}^+\Phi|^2 dx \,, \tag{133}$$

which establishes the positivity of A.

Next, we consider the case $\nu^2 < 0$. Let f be the C^1 function

$$f(x) \equiv \begin{cases} (\sin x)^2 & 0 < x \leqslant \eta \\ (\cos x)^2 \left\{ p(\sin x)^{1/2} + q(\sin x)^{-1/2} \right\} & \eta < x \leqslant \pi/2 \end{cases} \,, \tag{134}$$

where $0 < \eta < \pi/2$ and

$$p = \frac{(\sin\eta)^{3/2}\{4 + (\cos\eta)^2\}}{2(\cos\eta)^4} \,, \quad q = \frac{(\sin\eta)^{5/2}\{-4 + (\cos\eta)^2\}}{2(\cos\eta)^4} \,. \tag{135}$$

Straightforward calculation shows that for small η,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{\pi/2} f\left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\nu^2 - 1/4}{\sin^2 x} + \frac{\sigma^2 - 1/4}{\cos^2 x}\right) f dx \Big/ \int_0^{\pi/2} |f|^2 dx \\ &= -5\nu^2 \log\eta + C + O(\eta) \,, \end{aligned} \tag{136}$$

where C is a constant independent of η. Hence, for $\nu^2 < 0$, by taking $\eta \to 0$, the right hand side of eq. (136) can be made to take arbitrarily large negative values. However, this does not yet prove the desired result, since $f \notin \mathrm{Dom}(A) = C_0^\infty(0, \pi/2)$. To remedy this, we smooth f as follows. Let χ be an arbitrary smooth function with support contained within $(-\pi/4, \pi/4)$ satisfying $\int \chi(x)dx = 1$. Define $\chi_\epsilon(x) = \epsilon^{-1}\chi(x/\epsilon)$ (so that χ_ϵ approaches a δ-function as $\epsilon \to 0$) and define

$$f_\epsilon(x) \equiv \int \chi_\epsilon(x - x') f(-\epsilon + (1+\epsilon)x')dx' \,, \tag{137}$$

where we have extended the domain of definition of f beyond $[0, \pi/2]$ by setting $f(x) = 0$ whenever $x \notin [0, \pi/2]$. Then, for sufficiently small ϵ, we have $f_\epsilon \in C_0^\infty(0, \pi/2) = \mathrm{Dom}(A)$, so formula (133) holds. However, since f is C^1 and goes to zero sufficiently rapidly at $x = 0, \pi/2$, it is straightforward to check that as $\epsilon \to 0$, f_ϵ and $\tilde{D}^+ f_\epsilon$ converge uniformly on $[0, \pi/2]$ to f and $\tilde{D}^+ f$, respectively. It then follows that $(f_\epsilon, Af_\epsilon)_{L^2}/\|f_\epsilon\|^2_{L^2}$ converges to the left side of eq. (136) as $\epsilon \to 0$. Consequently, there exist $\Psi \in \mathrm{Dom}(A)$ such that $(\Psi, A\Psi)_{L^2}/\|\Psi\|^2_{L^2}$ takes arbitrarily large negative values. □

Thus, in case (iv), no positive, self-adjoint extensions of A exist, and there is no way of defining a sensible, stable dynamics. On the other hand, at least one positive, self-adjoint extension (namely, the Friedrichs extension) must exist in cases (i), (ii), and (iii). Our task is to find all of the positive, self-adjoint extensions of A in these cases.

There is a well known systematic method, due to von Neumann, for obtaining all of the self-adjoint extensions of an arbitrary symmetric operator on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We will now review this method (see e.g., Ref. [26] for proofs and further details). Let A be a symmetric operator with domain $\mathrm{Dom}(A)$, and let A^* denote the adjoint of A. Consider the subspaces $\mathscr{K}_\pm \subset \mathcal{H}$ (called *deficiency subspaces*) spanned by $\Phi_\pm \in \mathrm{Dom}(A^*)$ which satisfy respectively

$$A^*\Phi_\pm = \pm i\Phi_\pm \,. \tag{138}$$

Let $n_\pm = \dim(\mathscr{K}_\pm)$. (Either or both of n_+ and n_- may be infinite.) If $n_+ \neq n_-$, then no self-adjoint extension of A exists. If $n_+ = n_- = 0$, then there exists a unique self-adjoint extension, obtained by taking the closure of A (see e.g., Ref. [26]). On the other hand, if $n_+ = n_- \neq 0$, then all of the self-adjoint extensions of A can be constructed as follows: Let $U : \mathscr{K}_+ \to \mathscr{K}_-$ be a partial isometry, i.e., $\|\Phi_+\| = \|U\Phi_+\|$ for all $\Phi_+ \in \mathscr{K}_+$. Given U, we define the associated self-adjoint extension, A_E, of A by first taking the closure, $\bar{A}$, of A and then extending the domain of $\bar{A}$ by adding to it all elements of the form $\Phi_U = \Phi_+ + U\Phi_+$, i.e., we define

$$\mathrm{Dom}(A_E) = \{\Phi_0 + \Phi_+ + U\Phi_+ | \Phi_0 \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{A}), \Phi_+ \in \mathscr{K}_+\} \,. \tag{139}$$

For all $\Phi \in \mathrm{Dom}(A_E)$, we define

$$A_E\Phi = \bar{A}\Phi_0 + i\Phi_+ - iU\Phi_+ \,. \tag{140}$$

Then A_E is self-adjoint, and all self-adjoint extensions of A can be obtained in this manner. Thus, the self-adjoint extensions of A are in one-to-one correspondence with the partial isometries $U : \mathscr{K}_+ \to \mathscr{K}_-$.

From the definition of A^*, it can be seen immediately that eq. (138) is equivalent to the statement that for all $\Psi \in \mathrm{Dom}(A)$, we have

$$((A \pm i)\Psi, \Phi_\pm)_{\mathcal{H}} = 0 \,. \tag{141}$$

In our case, A is an elliptic differential operator with domain $C_0^\infty(0, \pi/2)$ on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2([0, \pi/2], dx)$. It follows immediately that $\Phi_\pm$ satisfies the equation $(A \mp i)\Phi_\pm = 0$ in the distributional sense. By elliptic regularity (see subsection 2.1 above), it follows that $\Phi_\pm$ must be smooth on $(0, \pi/2)$. Thus, in our case, the solutions to eq. (138) are precisely the smooth functions on $(0, \pi/2)$ that satisfy the ordinary differential equation

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{\nu^2 - 1/4}{\sin^2 x} + \frac{\sigma^2 - 1/4}{\cos^2 x}\right)\Phi_\pm = \pm i\Phi_\pm \,, \tag{142}$$

and are square integrable on $(0, \pi/2)$. We turn now to an analysis of solutions to this equation.

3.2 General solutions to the eigenvalue equation

In this subsection, we analyse solutions to the ordinary differential equation

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{\nu^2 - 1/4}{\sin^2 x} + \frac{\sigma^2 - 1/4}{\cos^2 x}\right)\Phi = \omega^2\Phi \,, \tag{143}$$

with σ given by eq. (127), with ν an arbitrary non-negative real number, $\nu \geqslant 0$. This encompasses cases (i), (ii), and (iii) of the previous subsection. As discussed in the previous subsection, the self-adjoint extensions of A can be determined by finding all the square integrable solutions to this equation for $\omega^2 = \pm i$. More generally since the problem of finding the self-adjoint extensions of A is obviously equivalent to the problem of finding the self-adjoint extensions of aA for any positive real number a, the self-adjoint extensions of A can be determined by finding the square integrable solutions to eq. (143) for $\omega^2 = \pm ai$ for any $a > 0$. It will turn out to be slightly more convenient to study this equation for $a = 2$, and we shall do so below. However, we also will be interested later in solutions to eq. (143) for $\omega^2 < 0$, i.e., ω imaginary. Therefore, at this stage we will allow ω to be an arbitrary complex number.

The general solution to the equation (143) is given, in terms of hypergeometric functions, by

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi &= (\sin x)^{\nu+1/2} \cdot (\cos x)^{-\sigma+1/2} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ B_1 \cdot (\cos x)^{2\sigma} \cdot F\left(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, \zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, 1+\sigma; \cos^2 x\right) + B_2 \cdot \tilde{F}(\cos^2 x) \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{144}$$

where $B_1,\ B_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, and here and hereafter we use the abbreviation

$$\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma} \equiv \frac{\nu+\sigma+1+\omega}{2}\,. \tag{145}$$

If σ is not an integer (i.e., when the number of spacetime dimensions is even), the second solution, $\tilde{F}(\cos^2 x)$, is given by

$$\tilde{F}(\cos^2 x) = F\left(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,-\sigma}, \zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,-\sigma}, 1-\sigma; \cos^2 x\right)\,. \tag{146}$$

If $\sigma+1$ is a natural number (i.e., when the number of spacetime dimensions is odd) then—with the exception of the case (which we shall not consider further here) where ω is real and either $0 < \zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma} \leqslant \sigma$ or $0 < \zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma} \leqslant \sigma$—then we have [31]

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F} &= F\left(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, \zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, 1+\sigma; \cos^2 x\right) \cdot \log(\cos^2 x) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}\right)_k \left(\zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}\right)_k}{(1+\sigma)_k\, k!} \cdot \{h(k) - h(0)\} \cdot (\cos x)^{2k} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^{\sigma} \frac{(k-1)!\,(-\sigma)_k}{\left(\zeta^{\omega}_{-\nu,-\sigma}\right)_k \left(\zeta^{-\omega}_{-\nu,-\sigma}\right)_k} \cdot (\cos x)^{-2k}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{147}$$

where

$$(\zeta)_k \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\zeta+k)}{\Gamma(\zeta)}\,, \tag{148}$$

$$\psi(z) \equiv \frac{d}{dz}\log\Gamma(z)\,, \tag{149}$$

$$h(k) \equiv \psi(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}+k) + \psi(\zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}+k) - \psi(1+\sigma+k) - \psi(k+1)\,, \tag{150}$$

and for the $\sigma = 0$ case, the third term in the right side of eq. (147) should be ignored.

We consider, now, the behaviour of these solutions near $x = \pi/2$, which corresponds to the origin of spherical coordinates in AdS spacetime. For $\sigma \geqslant 1$, it follows immediately from the general form (144) of the solutions that the square integrability of Φ at $x = \pi/2$ requires $B_2 = 0$. However, the situation is more subtle for the cases $\sigma = 1/2$ and $\sigma = 0$.

For the case $\sigma = 1/2$—which occurs only for an S-wave ($l = 0$) for a scalar field in 4-dimensional (i.e., $n = 2$) spacetime—the leading behaviour near $x = \pi/2$ is

$\Phi(x) \approx B_2 = const.$ Hence Φ is square-integrable even when $B_2 \neq 0$, and it might appear that both solutions to eq. (143) are acceptable. However, this is actually an artifact of our having artificially removed the origin from the spacetime when we used spherical coordinates to separate variables. (A similar phenomenon occurs when analysing the spherically symmetric eigenstates of the Hydrogen atom in ordinary quantum mechanics.) If we put the origin back and analyse Φ on the 3-dimensional space Σ, we find that the solution is not acceptable when $B_2 \neq 0$. To see this explicitly, define a Cartesian coordinate system, $\{X, Y, Z\}$, in a neighbourhood of the origin $x = \pi/2$ on a three-dimensional timeslice, Σ, such that $\pi/2 - x = \sqrt{X^2 + Y^2 + Z^2}$. Then, from eq. (42), the corresponding field, $\phi(X, Y, Z)$, defined on Σ is expressed in this neighbourhood as

$$\phi = \left(\frac{\sin x}{\cos x}\right)^{n/2} \Phi\mathbb{S} \approx \frac{B_2}{\sqrt{X^2 + Y^2 + Z^2}}\,. \tag{151}$$

This is square integrable in a neighbourhood of the origin $X = Y = Z = 0$ with the integration measure $V^{-1}d\Sigma = dXdYdZ$. However, let $\tilde{A}$ denote the 3-dimensional operator on $L^2(\Sigma, V^{-1}d\Sigma)$ corresponding to A. the leading order behaviour of $\tilde{A}\phi$ near the origin is given by

$$\begin{aligned} -VD^i(VD_i\phi) &\approx -(\partial^2/\partial X^2 + \partial^2/\partial Y^2 + \partial^2/\partial Z^2)\phi \\ &= 4\pi \cdot B_2 \cdot \delta(X)\delta(Y)\delta(Z)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{152}$$

where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Dirac delta function. As a consequence of this additional δ-function source, the "solution", ϕ, on Σ when $B_2 \neq 0$, does not actually correspond to a distributional solution of $\tilde{A}\phi = \omega^2\phi$ but rather to an equation that contains an additional δ-function source at the origin. In particular, when $\omega^2 = \pm 2i$, we do not obtain a solution to the analog of eq. (138) on Σ. Therefore, only the solution with $B_2 = 0$ is acceptable.

Similarly, for the case $\sigma = 0$—which occurs only for the S-wave ($l = 0$) for a scalar field in the 3-dimensional (i.e., $n = 1$) case—Φ behaves near $x = \pi/2$ as $\Phi \approx (\cos x)^{1/2}\,\{B_2 \log(\cos^2 x) + B_1 + \cdots\}$, which is square-integrable near $x = \pi/2$ even when $B_2 \neq 0$. However the original field ϕ defined on a 2-dimensional surface Σ behaves near the origin as

$$\phi \approx B_2 \log(X^2 + Y^2) + B_1 + \cdots\,, \tag{153}$$

with $\{X, Y\}$ being locally defined Cartesian coordinates as in the $\sigma = 1/2$ case. Again, if $B_2 \neq 0$, then on the 2-dimensional surface, Σ, ϕ does not correspond to a solution to the equation of interest but rather to an equation with an additional δ-function source. Thus, again the solutions with $B_2 \neq 0$ are not acceptable. Thus, hereafter we discard the second solution $\tilde{F}(\cos^2 x)$ in all cases.

Having set $B_2 = 0$, we now turn our attention to the boundary at $x = 0$, corresponding to infinity in AdS spacetime. In order to more easily see the

asymptotic behaviour of Φ near the boundary, it is convenient to transform the argument of the hypergeometric function F from $\cos^2 x$ to $\sin^2 x$. Using the linear transformation formulae for hypergeometric functions [32], we obtain the following expressions:
For $\nu \neq 0$, $\nu \notin \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi &= B_1 \cdot (\sin x)^{\nu+1/2} \cdot (\cos x)^{\sigma+1/2} \cdot F\left(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, \zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, 1+\sigma; \cos^2 x\right) \\ &= B_1 \cdot G_\nu(x) \cdot \left\{ \frac{\Gamma(1+\sigma)\Gamma(\nu)}{\Gamma(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma})\Gamma(\zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma})} \cdot F\left(\zeta^{\omega}_{-\nu,\sigma}, \zeta^{-\omega}_{-\nu,\sigma}, 1-\nu; \sin^2 x\right) \right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \frac{\Gamma(1+\sigma)\Gamma(-\nu)}{\Gamma(\zeta^{\omega}_{-\nu,\sigma})\Gamma(\zeta^{-\omega}_{-\nu,\sigma})} \cdot (\sin x)^{2\nu} \cdot F\left(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, \zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, 1+\nu; \sin^2 x\right) \right\}, \quad (154)\end{aligned}$$

where $G_\nu(x)$ was defined in eq. (130) above.
For $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi &= B_1 \cdot (\sin x)^{\nu+1/2} \cdot (\cos x)^{\sigma+1/2} \cdot F\left(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, \zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}, 1+\sigma; \cos^2 x\right) \\ &= B_1 \cdot G_\nu(x) \cdot \left[\frac{\Gamma(1+\sigma)\Gamma(\nu)}{\Gamma(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma})\Gamma(\zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma})} \sum_{k=0}^{\nu-1} \frac{(\zeta^{\omega}_{-\nu,\sigma})_k (\zeta^{-\omega}_{-\nu,\sigma})_k}{k!(1-\nu)_k} \cdot (\sin x)^{2k} \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{(-1)^\nu \Gamma(1+\sigma)}{\Gamma(\zeta^{\omega}_{-\nu,\sigma})\Gamma(\zeta^{-\omega}_{-\nu,\sigma})} \cdot (\sin x)^{2\nu} \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma})_k (\zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma})_k}{k!(\nu+k)!} \cdot (\sin x)^{2k} \cdot \Big\{ \log(\sin^2 x) \\ &\qquad \left. - \psi(k+1) - \psi(k+\nu+1) + \psi(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}+k) + \psi(\zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}+k) \Big\} \right]. \quad (155)\end{aligned}$$

For $\nu = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi &= B_1 \cdot (\sin x)^{1/2} \cdot (\cos x)^{\sigma+1/2} \cdot F(\zeta^{\omega}_{0,\sigma}, \zeta^{-\omega}_{0,\sigma}, 1+\sigma; \cos^2 x) \\ &= B_1 \cdot G_0(x) \cdot \frac{\Gamma(1+\sigma)}{\Gamma(\zeta^{\omega}_{0,\sigma})\Gamma(\zeta^{-\omega}_{0,\sigma})} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\zeta^{\omega}_{0,\sigma})_k (\zeta^{-\omega}_{0,\sigma})_k}{(k!)^2} \cdot (\sin x)^{2k} \\ &\qquad \times \left\{ 2\psi(k+1) - \psi(\zeta^{\omega}_{0,\sigma}+k) - \psi(\zeta^{-\omega}_{0,\sigma}+k) - \log(\sin^2 x) \right\}. \quad (156)\end{aligned}$$

When $\nu \geqslant 1$ (i.e., case (i) above), we see from eq. (154) for $\nu \notin \mathbb{N}$ (and eq. (155) for $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$) that Φ fails to be square integrable, except for the case in which ω is a real number such that either $\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}$ or $\zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma}$ becomes zero or a negative integer, i.e.,

$$\omega = \mp(2m+1+\nu+\sigma), \quad m = 0,\, 1,\, 2,\, \ldots\,. \quad (157)$$

(When eq. (157) holds, then either $\Gamma(\zeta^{\omega}_{\nu,\sigma})$ or $\Gamma(\zeta^{-\omega}_{\nu,\sigma})$ diverges, so the first term of the right side of eq. (154) for $\nu \notin \mathbb{N}$ (or the first term of eq. (155) for $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$) vanishes.) When $0 < \nu < 1$ (case (ii)) we see from eq. (154) that Φ is square integrable for all $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$. When $\nu = 0$ (case (iii)) we see from eq. (156) that Φ also is square-integrable for all $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$.

3.3 Self-adjoint extensions

In this subsection, we shall determine all of the positive self-adjoint extensions of the operator A, eq. (128) that satisfy the regularity condition at the origin, $x = \pi/2$, discussed in the previous subsection. (As discussed in the previous subsection, this additional regularity condition need be imposed only in the case of the $l = 0$ modes of a scalar field in 3 and 4 spacetime dimensions.) We have already seen in Proposition 3.1 that if $\nu^2 < 0$ (case (iv)), A itself is unbounded below, so, clearly, no positive self-adjoint extensions exist. Thus, we need only consider cases (i), (ii), and (iii). In these cases, A is positive, so there always exists at least one positive self-adjoint extension.

As explained in subsection 3.1 and at the beginning of subsection 3.2, we will determine all of the possible self-adjoint extensions of A by finding all of the square-integrable solutions to eq. (143) with $\omega^2 = \pm 2i$. We have just seen that in case (i) (i.e., $\nu^2 \geqslant 1$), there are no such solutions, so the deficiency subspaces are trivial. Hence, there is a unique self-adjoint extension of A, which is automatically positive. Thus, dynamics is well defined in this case, without the need to specify any additional boundary conditions at infinity. One may interpret this result as being a consequence of the fact that the effective potential term in A is sufficiently repulsive near infinity that the fields are completely reflected back without ever reaching the boundary. Hence, no boundary conditions at infinity need be imposed.

On the other hand, in cases (ii) and (iii), we found in the previous subsection that there is precisely one linearly independent square integrable solution to the eigenvector equation (143) with $\omega^2 = \pm 2i$ that satisfies the regularity condition at the origin. Consequently, each of the deficiency subspaces $\mathscr{K}_\pm$ (for the operator $2A$) is one-dimensional, and is spanned by the vector $\Phi_\pm$ of eqs. (154) (for case (ii)) and (156) (for case (iii)), with $\omega = 1 \pm i$, respectively, and with $(B_1)_\pm$ chosen so that $\|\Phi_+\|_{L^2} = \|\Phi_-\|_{L^2} = 1$.

Since $n_+ = n_- = 1$ the only (partial) isometries from $\mathscr{K}_+$ to $\mathscr{K}_-$ are given by

$$U_\alpha \Phi_+ = e^{i\alpha} \Phi_- \tag{158}$$

where $\alpha \in (-\pi, \pi]$. Hence, in cases (ii) and (iii) there exists a one-parameter family of self-adjoint extensions, A_α, of A, (see eqs. (139) and (140)) parametrised by $\alpha \in (-\pi, \pi]$. Our remaining tasks are (1) to interpret the choice of extension, A_α, in terms of a choice of boundary condition at infinity and (2) to determine for what values of α the extension A_α is positive.

In order to investigate both of these issues, we need to know the asymptotic behaviour of

$$\Phi_\alpha \equiv \Phi_+ + e^{i\alpha} \Phi_- \tag{159}$$

near $x = 0$. For $0 < \nu < 1$, we obtain

$$\Phi_\alpha \;\; \propto \;\; G_\nu(x) \cdot \left\{ a_\nu + b_\nu (\sin x)^{2\nu} + c_\nu (\sin x)^2 + \cdots \right\} , \tag{160}$$

where $G_\nu(x)$ was defined in eq. (130) above. Here the coefficients of the two leading terms are given by

$$a_\nu = -\frac{2e^{i\alpha/2}\Gamma(1+\sigma)\Gamma(\nu)}{\left|\zeta_{\nu,\sigma}^{-(1+i)}\right|\left|\Gamma\left(\zeta_{\nu,\sigma}^{-(1+i)}\right)\right|^2}\cdot\sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}-\theta_{+\nu}\right), \tag{161}$$

$$b_\nu = -\frac{2e^{i\alpha/2}\Gamma(1+\sigma)\Gamma(-\nu)}{\left|\zeta_{-\nu,\sigma}^{-(1+i)}\right|\left|\Gamma\left(\zeta_{-\nu,\sigma}^{-(1+i)}\right)\right|^2}\cdot\sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}-\theta_{-\nu}\right) = a_{-\nu}\,, \tag{162}$$

where we have used the facts that $\zeta_{\nu,\sigma}^{1+i} = \zeta_{\nu,\sigma}^{-(1+i)*} + 1$, $\zeta_{\nu,\sigma}^{1-i} = \zeta_{\nu,\sigma}^{-(1+i)} + 1$, and $\zeta_{\nu,\sigma}^{-(1-i)} = \zeta_{\nu,\sigma}^{-(1+i)*}$, and where we have defined $\theta_{\pm\nu} \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ by

$$\sin\theta_{\pm\nu} \equiv \frac{\pm\nu+\sigma}{\sqrt{1+(\pm\nu+\sigma)^2}}\,. \tag{163}$$

Similarly, for $\nu = 0$ we obtain

$$\Phi_\alpha \propto G_0(x)\cdot\Big\{a_0\log(\sin^2 x) + b_0 + c_0(\sin x)^2\log(\sin^2 x) + \cdots\Big\}\,. \tag{164}$$

Using the property of the digamma function, $\psi(z+1) = \psi(z) + 1/z$ (see eq. (149)), we find that the leading two coefficients are

$$a_0 = \frac{2e^{i\alpha/2}\Gamma(1+\sigma)}{\left|\zeta_{0,\sigma}^{-(1+i)}\right|\left|\Gamma\left(\zeta_{0,\sigma}^{-(1+i)}\right)\right|^2}\cdot\sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}-\theta_0\right), \tag{165}$$

$$b_0 = \frac{2e^{i\alpha/2}\Gamma(1+\sigma)}{\left|\zeta_{0,\sigma}^{-(1+i)}\right|\left|\Gamma\left(\zeta_{0,\sigma}^{-(1+i)}\right)\right|^2}\cdot\Bigg[2\cos^2\theta_0\cdot\cos\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}-\theta_0\right) + 2\left\{\gamma + \mathrm{Re}\left[\psi\left(\zeta_{0,\sigma}^{-(1+i)}\right)\right] + \sin\theta_0\cos\theta_0\right\}\cdot\sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}-\theta_0\right)\Bigg], \tag{166}$$

with γ being Euler number and with $\theta_0 \in [0, \pi/2)$ defined by

$$\sin\theta_0 \equiv \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{1+\sigma^2}}\,. \tag{167}$$

By inspection of eqs. (161)-(162) we see that in case (ii) (i.e., $0 < \nu < 1$), the value of α is in one-to-one correspondence with the value of the ratio b_ν/a_ν, which may take any real value (including $\pm\infty$, corresponding to $a_\nu = 0$). Thus, in case (ii), the choice of self-adjoint extension of A is uniquely specified by the value of b_ν/a_ν, and a self-adjoint extension exists for any specified real value of this quantity (including $\pm\infty$). Similarly, inspection of eqs. (165)-(166) shows that in case (iii) (i.e., $\nu = 0$), the self-adjoint extensions of A are uniquely characterised by the ratio b_0/a_0, which may assume any real value (including $\pm\infty$).

The relationship between the choice of extension and the choice of boundary conditions can now be seen as follows. It is easily seen that for arbitrary initial data in C_0^∞ the general evolution law (4) yields $\phi_t \in \mathrm{Dom}(A_E)$. However, from eq. (139), we see that $\mathrm{Dom}(A_E)$ consists of vectors in the domain of the closure of A—which have as rapid fall-off as is possible at the boundary—together with vectors of the form $\Phi_\alpha = \Phi_+ + U\Phi_+$. Therefore, the boundary conditions that are satisfied by vectors of this latter form are the boundary conditions that will be satisfied by all solutions that arise from arbitrary initial data in C_0^∞. Consequently, the choice of self-adjoint extension in cases (ii) and (iii) corresponds precisely to the specification of the allowed asymptotic behaviour (as determined by the values of b_ν/a_ν and b_0/a_0, respectively) of solutions near infinity.

The interpretation of the allowed boundary conditions at infinity is most apparent in the conformally invariant case, $\nu = 1/2$, since in this case, the effective potential term in the operator A is regular at the boundary. For $\nu = 1/2$, it is easily seen from eq. (160) that we have

$$\left.\frac{\partial\Phi_\alpha/\partial x}{\Phi_\alpha}\right|_{x=0} = \frac{b_\nu}{a_\nu}\,. \tag{168}$$

Therefore, we see that the choice $b_\nu/a_\nu = \pm\infty$ (i.e., $a_\nu = 0$) corresponds to the Dirichlet boundary condition, $\Phi_\alpha|_{x=0} = 0$, and the choice $b_\nu/a_\nu = 0$ corresponds to the Neumann boundary condition, $\partial\Phi_\alpha/\partial x|_{x=0} = 0$. The other real choices of b_ν/a_ν correspond to general Robin boundary conditions, in which a linear combination of $\Phi_\alpha|_{x=0}$ and $\partial\Phi_\alpha/\partial x|_{x=0}$ is required to vanish.

For $\nu \neq 1/2$, the effective potential term in A is divergent at $x = 0$ and the ratio $(\partial\Phi_\alpha/\partial x)/\Phi_\alpha$ itself is no longer well-defined at $x = 0$. Nevertheless, for $0 < \nu < 1$, the dominant behaviour of $G_\nu^{-1}\Phi_\alpha$ as $x \to 0$ is governed by a_ν, whereas the dominant behaviour of $\partial(G_\nu^{-1}\Phi_\alpha)/\partial x$ is governed by b_ν. Therefore, for $0 < \nu < 1$, it seems natural to define "generalized Dirichlet conditions" as corresponding to the case $a_\nu = 0$ and "generalized Neumann conditions" as corresponding to the case $b_\nu = 0$. The other choices of self-adjoint extensions may be viewed as corresponding to generalized Robin conditions[5]. The Friedrich's extension corresponds to the choice $a_\nu = 0$, i.e., to generalized Dirichlet conditions.

For $\nu = 0$, the dominant behaviour of both $G_0^{-1}\Phi_\alpha$ and $\partial(G_0^{-1}\Phi_\alpha)/\partial x$ as $x \to 0$ is governed by a_0. Thus, we may interpret the self-adjoint extension with $a_0 = 0$ as corresponding to the simultaneous imposition of generalized Dirichlet and Neumann conditions. This extension is precisely the Friedrich's extension.

[5]Generalized Robin boundary conditions play a role in the AdS-CFT correspondence when one considers the double-trace perturbations of the quantum field theory on the boundary at infinity. In this context, the ratio b_ν/a_ν appears in the action for the boundary field theory as a coupling constant to the double-trace interaction, and generalized Dirichlet and Neumann conditions correspond to fixed points of a renormalization group flow in the quantum field theory on the boundary [12] (see also, e.g., [33, 34, 35, 15] and references therein).

We turn now to the determination of which of the self-adjoint extensions A_α are positive. Our main results are given by the following theorem:

Theorem 3.2: Let A be the operator eq. (128) on the Hilbert space $L^2([0,\pi/2])$, defined on the domain $C_0^\infty(0,\pi/2)$. Then the self-adjoint extensions of A—satisfying the regularity condition[6] at the origin $x = \pi/2$ (see subsection 3.2)—and the positivity properties of these extensions are as follows:
case (i) If $\nu^2 \geqslant 1$, then there exists a unique self-adjoint extension, and it is positive.
case (ii) If $0 < \nu^2 < 1$, then the self-adjoint extensions of A comprise a one-parameter family, A_α. These extensions are characterised by the ratio b_ν/a_ν, which may assume any real value, but the extensions are positive if and only if b_ν/a_ν satisfies

$$\frac{b_\nu}{a_\nu} \geqslant -\left|\frac{\Gamma(-\nu)}{\Gamma(\nu)}\right| \frac{\Gamma\left(\zeta^0_{\nu,\sigma}\right)^2}{\Gamma\left(\zeta^0_{-\nu,\sigma}\right)^2}\,, \tag{169}$$

(This inequality includes the case $b_\nu/a_\nu = \infty$, i.e., generalized Dirichlet conditions, $a_\nu = 0$.) In terms of α, this condition is expressed as

$$\frac{\sin\left(\alpha/2-\theta_{-\nu}\right)}{\sin\left(\alpha/2-\theta_{+\nu}\right)} \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{1+(-\nu+\sigma)^2}{1+(\nu+\sigma)^2}} \cdot \frac{\left|\Gamma\left(\zeta^{-(1+i)}_{-\nu,\sigma}\right)\right|^2}{\left|\Gamma\left(\zeta^{-(1+i)}_{\nu,\sigma}\right)\right|^2} \frac{\Gamma\left(\zeta^0_{\nu,\sigma}\right)^2}{\Gamma\left(\zeta^0_{-\nu,\sigma}\right)^2}\,. \tag{170}$$

case (iii) If $\nu^2 = 0$, then the self-adjoint extensions of A comprise a one-parameter family, A_α. These extensions are characterised by the ratio b_0/a_0, which may assume any real value, and are positive if and only if

$$\frac{b_0}{a_0} \leqslant 2\gamma + 2\psi\left(\zeta^0_{0,\sigma}\right)\,. \tag{171}$$

(This inequality includes the case $b_0/a_0 = -\infty$, i.e., generalized Dirichlet-Neumann conditions, $a_0 = 0$.) In terms of α, this condition is expressed as

$$\frac{\cos\left(\alpha/2-\theta_0\right)}{\sin\left(\alpha/2-\theta_0\right)} \leqslant (1+\sigma^2)\cdot\left\{\psi\left(\frac{\sigma+1}{2}\right) - \mathrm{Re}\left[\psi\left(\frac{\sigma-i}{2}\right)\right] - \frac{\sigma}{1+\sigma^2}\right\}\,. \tag{172}$$

case (iv) If $\nu^2 < 0$, then A itself is unbounded below, so all self-adjoint extensions of A are unbounded below.

Proof: We have already proven the above claims for cases (i) and (iv), and we have also established that in cases (ii) and (iii), the self-adjoint extensions of A

[6] As discussed in subsection 3.2, this regularity condition is relevant only for the $l = 0$ modes of a scalar field in 3 and 4 spacetime dimensions.

comprise a one-parameter family, A_α. Therefore, it remains only to prove the positivity claims in cases (ii) and (iii).

It is worth noting that by a relatively straightforward calculation A_α can be seen to be positive whenever $b_\nu/a_\nu \geqslant 0$ in case (ii) and when $a_0 = 0$ in case (iii). Namely, to prove the positivity of A_α, it suffices to prove its positivity on the smaller domain $\mathcal{D}_\alpha$ defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_\alpha = \{\Phi_0 + c\Phi_\alpha | \Phi_0 \in \mathrm{Dom}(A), c \in \mathbb{C}\}\,, \tag{173}$$

since it is clear that A_α is the closure of its restriction to $\mathcal{D}_\alpha$ and positivity is preserved under taking closures. Note that all $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ are smooth. Furthermore, since $A_\alpha(\Phi_0 + c\Phi_\alpha) = A\Phi_0 + 2ic\Phi_+ - 2ice^{i\alpha}\Phi_-$ (where the factor of 2 difference from eq. (140) arises from our present use of $\pm 2i$ rather than $\pm i$ in the definition of the deficiency subspaces), it follows that for all $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$, we have

$$(\Phi, A\Phi)_{L^2} = \int_0^{\pi/2} \Phi^* \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\nu^2 - 1/4}{\sin^2 x} + \frac{\sigma^2 - 1/4}{\cos^2 x} \right) \Phi dx\,. \tag{174}$$

As in Proposition 3.1, we may write

$$A = \tilde{D}^- \tilde{D}^+ + (-\nu + \sigma + 1)^2 \tag{175}$$

with

$$\tilde{D}^\pm \equiv \pm \frac{d}{dx} - {G_\nu}^{-1} \frac{dG_\nu}{dx}\,, \tag{176}$$

where $G_\nu(x)$ is given by eq. (130).

In case (ii)—i.e., when $0 < \nu < 1$—it can be checked that $\tilde{D}^+\Phi$ is square-integrable for all $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$. Consequently, integration by parts can be justified, and we obtain

$$(\Phi, A\Phi)_{L^2} = \left[-\Phi^* \tilde{D}^+ \Phi \right]_0^{\pi/2} + (-\nu + \sigma + 1)^2 \int_0^{\pi/2} |\Phi|^2 dx + \int_0^{\pi/2} |\tilde{D}^+\Phi|^2 dx\,. \tag{177}$$

The boundary term from the origin, $x = \pi/2$, vanishes. The boundary term from $x = 0$ is easily evaluated to yield

$$(\Phi, A_\alpha\Phi)_{L^2} = 2\nu a_\nu^* b_\nu + (-\nu + \sigma + 1)^2 \|\Phi\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\tilde{D}^+\Phi\|_{L^2}^2\,, \tag{178}$$

where a_ν and b_ν are given by eqs. (161) and (162). Note that $\nu a_\nu^* b_\nu$ is always real (since b_ν/a_ν is real for any self-adjoint extension), as must be the case, since A_α is self-adjoint. By inspection, A_α will be positive whenever $a_\nu^* b_\nu \geqslant 0$, as is the case whenever $b_\nu/a_\nu \geqslant 0$, including the case $a_\nu = 0$.

In case (iii)—i.e., when $\nu = 0$—we observe from (164) that the asymptotic behaviour of $\tilde{D}^+\Phi_\alpha$ near $x = 0$ is

$$\tilde{D}^+\Phi_\alpha = 2(\cos x)^{\sigma+3/2} \left\{ a_0 (\sin x)^{-1/2} + c_0 (\sin x)^{3/2} \log(\sin^2 x) + \cdots \right\}\,. \tag{179}$$

We see, therefore, that $\tilde{D}^+\Phi_\alpha$ is *not* square integrable except for the case when $a_0 = 0$. In this latter case, integration by parts is again justified, and we have

$$(\Phi, A_\alpha \Phi)_{L^2} = (\sigma+1)^2 \|\Phi\|^2_{L^2} + \|\tilde{D}^+\Phi\|^2_{L^2} \geqslant 0\,, \tag{180}$$

so A_α is positive, as claimed.

To determine the precise range of positivity of A_α in cases (ii) and (iii), we note that since A_α is strictly positive on the original domain of A (namely, the C_0^∞ functions) and since the deficiency subspaces are only 1-dimensional, the negative spectral subspace of A_α can be at most 1-dimensional. If the strictly negative spectral subspace of A_α is 0-dimensional, then A_α is positive. On the other hand, if the strictly negative spectral subspace of A_α is 1-dimensional, then A_α must have an eigenvector, Ψ_β, of negative eigenvalue, $-\beta^2$, with $\beta > 0$. By elliptic regularity, Ψ_β must be a smooth solution to the differential equation (143),

$$\left(-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{\nu^2 - 1/4}{\sin^2 x} + \frac{\sigma^2 - 1/4}{\cos^2 x}\right)\Psi_\beta = -\beta^2 \Psi_\beta\,. \tag{181}$$

Furthermore, in order to lie in the closure of $\mathcal{D}_\alpha$, it is necessary that the asymptotic behaviour of Ψ_β approach that of $c\Phi_\alpha$ at $x = 0$ for some constant $c \in \mathbb{C}$ in the sense that as $x \to 0$ we must have $\Psi_\beta - c\Phi_\alpha = o([\sin(x)]^{\nu+1/2})$.

In case (ii), it follows from our general solution, eq. (154), with $\omega = i\beta$ that in order to have the required asymptotic behaviour of Ψ_β as $x \to 0$, β must satisfy

$$\frac{\left|\Gamma\left(\zeta^{i\beta}_{\nu,\sigma}\right)\right|^2}{\left|\Gamma\left(\zeta^{i\beta}_{-\nu,\sigma}\right)\right|^2} = \frac{b_\nu \Gamma(\nu)}{a_\nu \Gamma(-\nu)}\,. \tag{182}$$

It follows from the properties of the gamma-function that for fixed $\sigma \geqslant 0$ and fixed ν in the range $0 < \nu < 1$, the left side of this equation can be made arbitrarily large by letting $\beta \to \infty$ and takes its minimum at $\beta = 0$. Taking into account the fact that $\Gamma(\nu)/\Gamma(-\nu)$ is negative for $0 < \nu < 1$, it follows that a solution to eq. (181) with $\beta > 0$ satisfying the required asymptotic behaviour exists if and only if

$$\frac{b_\nu}{a_\nu} < -\left|\frac{\Gamma(-\nu)}{\Gamma(\nu)}\right| \frac{\Gamma\left(\zeta^0_{\nu,\sigma}\right)^2}{\Gamma\left(\zeta^0_{-\nu,\sigma}\right)^2}\,. \tag{183}$$

Thus, eigenvector of negative eigenvalue exists—and hence A_α fails to be positive—if and only if this equation holds. This proves the claims of the theorem for case (ii).

Similarly, in case (iii), it follows from our general solution, eq. (156), that in order to have the required asymptotic behaviour as $x \to 0$, β must satisfy

$$2\gamma + \psi\left(\zeta^{i\beta}_{0,\sigma}\right) + \psi\left(\zeta^{-i\beta}_{0,\sigma}\right) = \frac{b_0}{a_0}\,. \tag{184}$$

From the properties of the digamma function, $\psi(x)$, we see that the left side achieves its minimum value when $\beta = 0$ and becomes arbitrarily large when $\beta \to \infty$. Thus, we can solve this equation—and thereby obtain an eigenvector of A_α of negative eigenvalue—if and only

$$\frac{b_0}{a_0} > 2\gamma + 2\psi\left(\zeta^0_{0,\sigma}\right) \ . \tag{185}$$

This proves the claims of the theorem for case (iii). □

We conclude with several remarks.

As already noted, case (ii) was considered by Breitenlohner and Freedman [8, 9] for scalar fields in 4-dimensional AdS spacetime. They showed that with the imposition of generalized Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions, the initial value problem is well-posed in this case. Their choice of these boundary conditions arose from the requirement that an energy functional for the scalar field be finite, positive, and conserved. However, they considered only two types of energy functionals: the usual energy functional of a minimally coupled scalar field, and a conformal ("improved") energy functional. The requirement that the usual energy functional be conserved allows only the generalized Dirichlet boundary condition, whereas conservation of the conformal energy allows us to take either the generalized Dirichlet or the generalized Neumann boundary condition. We wish to emphasise here that for *any* choice of a positive self-adjoint extension A_E, it is always possible to define a conserved, positive energy E for all $\Phi \in \mathrm{Dom}(A_E)$ by

$$E(\Phi) \equiv (\dot{\Phi}, \dot{\Phi})_{L^2} + (\Phi, A_E\Phi)_{L^2} \ , \tag{186}$$

where $\dot{\Phi} \equiv \partial\Phi/\partial t$. The generalized Dirichlet and Neumann conditions considered in [8, 9], are merely two values of the one-parameter family of choices given by eq. (169). For each boundary condition in this range, there is a corresponding conserved, positive energy (see also [11] for another definition of such a positive, conserved energy in the scalar field case).

As we have proven above, in cases (ii) and (iii), A also admits non-positive self-adjoint extensions; in case (iv), all self-adjoint extensions are unbounded below. If one chooses a non-positive self-adjoint extension, then one can still define dynamics in a manner analogous to eq. (4), but the dynamics will be unstable in the sense that generic solutions will grow unboundedly in time (see [36]). Indeed, in case (iv), since A is unbounded below, generic solutions will always grow in time more rapidly than $\exp(at)$ for any positive a.

We note that our analysis shows that in AdS spacetime of any dimension, it is always possible to define a stable dynamics for electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations. In spacetime dimension $\geqslant 7$, the dynamics is unique, and no choice of boundary conditions at infinity need be made at all. However, in 4 and 6 dimensions, one must make a choice of boundary conditions (in the range defined

by eq. (169)) for the scalar type of electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations; in 4 dimensions, one must also choose boundary conditions in this range for the vector type of electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations. Similarly, in 5-dimensional AdS spacetime one must make a choice of boundary conditions (in the range defined by eq. (171)) for the scalar type of electromagnetic and gravitational perturbations. Each of these choices of boundary conditions corresponds to a different theory of classical bulk dynamics.

Particularly interesting in the context of the AdS-CFT correspondence is the case in which the bulk geometry contains a black hole [37]. In the Schwarzschild-AdS background, we also can obtain master equations for perturbations [30] analogous to those derived in this paper. We then expect the same classification (i)-(iv) of the corresponding operator A to hold, because the classification (i)-(iv) is made by inspecting merely the asymptotic behaviour of perturbations near the boundary. However, since the effective potential term in the corresponding operator A will change significantly near the black hole event horizon [38], we would expect that the precise relation between the positivity of self-adjoint extensions and the boundary conditions at infinity will change.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Gary Gibbons, Sean Hartnoll, Stefan Hollands, and Hideo Kodama for many helpful discussions and useful suggestions. RMW wishes to thank the Yukawa Institute for its hospitality during the time some of this research was carried out, and AI wishes to thank the Enrico Fermi Institute for its hospitality during the time other parts of this research were carried out. This research was supported in part by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and by NSF grant PHY 00-90138 to the University of Chicago.

Appendix

We show here that for the $l = 1$ modes, there exist no dynamical degrees of freedom for gravitational perturbations (i.e., no dipole gravitational radiation). (See also [28].)

Consider, first, the vector type of perturbations. For $l = 1$ ($k_V^2 = n - 1$), $\mathbb{V}_i$ becomes a Killing vector field on the n-sphere. Then $2D_{(i}h_T^{(1)}{}_{j)}$ in (73) vanishes, and therefore $H_T^{(1)}$ is not defined. In this case, we can find a gauge-invariant variable

$$Z^{(1)}{}_{ab} = r^2\widehat{\nabla}_a\left(\frac{H^{(1)}{}_b}{r^2}\right) - r^2\widehat{\nabla}_b\left(\frac{H^{(1)}{}_a}{r^2}\right), \tag{187}$$

which has only a single independent component. Then the linearised Einstein equations for ${Z^{(1)}}_{ab}$ become

$$\widehat{\nabla}^a(r^n {Z^{(1)}}_{ab}) = 0\,, \tag{188}$$

and can be explicitly solved, yielding

$${Z^{(1)}}_{ab} = \epsilon_{ab}\frac{C}{r^n}\,, \tag{189}$$

where C is a constant. Therefore the vector-type perturbation of the $l = 1$ mode is a non-dynamical (i.e., time independent) perturbation, which can be interpreted as describing a change in the angular momentum of the background.

For $l = 1$ ($k_S^2 = n$) of scalar-type perturbation, $D_i\mathbb{S}$ is a conformal Killing vector field, that is, $D_iD_j\mathbb{S} + \gamma_{ij}\mathbb{S}$ identically vanishes. Hence the term $h_T^{(0)}$ in (73) is not present. Setting $H_T^{(0)} = 0$ in the definitions (99) and (100) (and $X_a \equiv -{H^{(0)}}_a$), we can still use Z and Z_{ab} as metric perturbation variables, but in this case, Z and Z_{ab} are no longer gauge-invariant and equation (103) is not obtained. Under gauge-transformations generated by ${\xi^{(0)}}_a\mathbb{S}dy^a + \xi^{(0)}D_i\mathbb{S}dz^i$, we find in particular, ${Z^a}_a - Z \to {Z^a}_a - Z + \bar{\delta}({Z^a}_a - Z)$ with

$$\bar{\delta}({Z^a}_a - Z) \equiv -r^{n/2}\left\{\widehat{\nabla}^c\widehat{\nabla}_c - \frac{(n-2)(n-4)}{4}\frac{1}{r^2} - \frac{n(n+2)}{4}\frac{1}{\ell^2}\right\}\Xi\,, \tag{190}$$

where $\Xi \equiv -2r^{(n-4)/2}\xi^{(0)}$. This implies that we can make eq. (103) hold by choosing Ξ suitably, or in other words we can impose eq. (103) as a gauge condition. In this way, even for the $l = 1$ modes, we can recover the same expression of the linearised Einstein equations for Z and Z_{ab} as in the $l \geqslant 2$ case.

We should note however that the gauge condition ${Z^a}_a - Z = 0$ does not completely fix gauges; it is possible to take further gauge transformations generated by Ξ that satisfies the homogeneous equation

$$\left\{\widehat{\nabla}^a\widehat{\nabla}_a - \frac{(n-2)(n-4)}{4}\frac{1}{r^2} - \frac{n(n+2)}{4}\frac{1}{\ell^2}\right\}\Xi = 0\,. \tag{191}$$

Therefore the remaining gauge degrees of freedom are characterised by two arbitrary functions of t, i.e., initial data $(\Xi, \partial\Xi/\partial r)$ on a Cauchy surface $r = r_0$ in the globally hyperbolic spacetime $(O^2, -g_{ab})$.

Now we shall show that the solutions Z and Z_{ab} to the linearised Einstein equations are gauge modes; Z and Z_{ab} can be made to vanish by further gauge transformations. First, with the gauge condition (103), repeating the same argument as in the $l \geqslant 2$ case (below eq. (104)), we can express Z_{ab} in terms of a scalar function ϕ_ξ as

$$Z_{ab} = \left(\widehat{\nabla}_a\widehat{\nabla}_b - \frac{1}{\ell^2}g_{ab}\right)\phi_\xi\,, \tag{192}$$

where ϕ_ξ satisfies the linearised Einstein equation (see eqs. (120) and (121) with $k_S^2 = n$)

$$E(\phi_\xi) \equiv r^2 \left(\widehat{\nabla}^a \widehat{\nabla}_a - n \frac{\widehat{\nabla}^a r}{r} \widehat{\nabla}_a + \frac{n-2}{\ell^2} \right) \phi_\xi = V \left(c_2 \sin t + c_3 \cos t \right) , \quad (193)$$

with c_2, c_3 being arbitrary constants. Note that the term $c_1'' r$, which may exist in the right hand side (see eq. (123)), has been already set to zero by using the residual freedom of ϕ_ξ defined by eq. (118). Next, we find the gauge transformation $Z_{ab} \to Z'_{ab} = Z_{ab} + \bar{\delta} Z_{ab}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\delta} Z_{ab} \equiv & -r^{n/2} \Bigg\{ \widehat{\nabla}_a \widehat{\nabla}_b \Xi - \frac{(n-2)}{2} \left(\frac{\widehat{\nabla}_a r}{r} \widehat{\nabla}_b \Xi + \frac{\widehat{\nabla}_b r}{r} \widehat{\nabla}_a \Xi \right) \\ & + (n-1) g_{ab} \frac{\widehat{\nabla}^c r}{r} \widehat{\nabla}_c \Xi + \frac{n(n-2)}{4} \frac{(\widehat{\nabla}_a r) \widehat{\nabla}_b r}{r^2} \Xi - \frac{n}{2} \frac{\widehat{\nabla}_a \widehat{\nabla}_b r}{r} \Xi \\ & + (n-1) g_{ab} \left[\frac{1}{r^2} - \frac{n}{2} \frac{(\widehat{\nabla}^c r) \widehat{\nabla}_c r}{r^2} \right] \Xi \Bigg\} , \end{aligned} \quad (194)$$

where Ξ satisfies eq. (191). To achieve the gauge $Z'_{ab} = 0$, we consider on an initial Cauchy surface $r = r_0$ the equations

$$Z'_{ab} = \bar{\delta} Z_{ab}(\Xi) + \left(\widehat{\nabla}_a \widehat{\nabla}_b - \frac{1}{\ell^2} g_{ab} \right) \phi_\xi = 0 . \quad (195)$$

The trace part of eq. (195) is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & V r^{(n-2)/2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{1}{V r^{(n-2)/2}} \Xi \right) - \frac{V}{r^{n/2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\frac{r^{n/2}}{V} \Phi_\xi \right) \\ & \qquad = \frac{1}{n r^{(n+2)/2} V} \left(c_2 \sin t + c_3 \cos t \right) , \end{aligned} \quad (196)$$

where $\Phi_\xi \equiv r^{-n/2} \phi_\xi$ and we have used eqs. (191) and (193). Note that the constants c_2 and c_3 in the right side of this equation are actually required to vanish due to the consistency with the (t, r)-component of eq. (195), and that in the case Φ_ξ obeys the homogeneous master equation $E(r^{n/2} \Phi_\xi) = 0$. The (t, t)-component of eq. (195) is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial V^2}{\partial r} + (n-1) \frac{V^2}{r} \right\} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \Xi \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{V^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \Xi - \left\{ \frac{n}{4r} \frac{\partial V^2}{\partial r} - \frac{(n-1)}{r^2} + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \frac{V^2}{r^2} \right\} \Xi \\ & \qquad = \left\{ - \frac{1}{V^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial V^2}{\partial r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \left(\frac{n}{4r} \frac{\partial V^2}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{\ell^2} \right) \right\} \Phi_\xi . \end{aligned} \quad (197)$$

For any $(\Phi_\xi, \partial\Phi_\xi/\partial r)$, solving eqs. (196) and (197), we obtain the initial data $(\Xi, \partial\Xi/\partial r)$ that satisfy eq. (195) on the initial surface $r = r_0$. Then we define Ξ to be the solution of eq. (191) with these initial data so that $Z'_{ab} = 0$ is achieved throughout $(O^2, -g_{ab})$.

References

[1] G.W. Gibbons, *Anti-de Sitter spacetime and its uses*, in Mathematical and Quantum Aspects of Relativity and Cosmology. Proceedings of the 2nd Samos Meeting on Cosmology, Geometry and Relativity, S. Cotsakis and G.W. Gibbons eds, *Springer Lecture Notes of Physics*, 102-142 (2000).

[2] J. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2, 231 (1998).

[3] S.S. Gubser, I.R. Klebanov and A.M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **B 428**, 105 (1998).

[4] E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2, 253 (1998).

[5] O. Aharony, S.S. Gubser, J. Maldacena, H. Ooguri, and Y. Oz, Phys. Rep. **323** 183 (2000).

[6] R.M. Wald, *General Relativity*, University of Chicago Press (Chicago, 1984).

[7] S.J. Avis, C.J. Isham, and D. Storey, Phys. Rev. D **18**, 3565 (1978).

[8] P. Breitenlohner and D.Z. Freedman, Phys. Lett. **115 B**, 197 (1982).

[9] P. Breitenlohner and D.Z. Freedman, Ann. Phys. **144**, 249-281 (1982).

[10] P. Minces and V.O. Rivelles, Nucl. Phys. **B 572**, 651 (2000).

[11] P. Minces and V.O. Rivelles, J. High Energy Phys. **0112**, 010 (2001).

[12] E. Witten, hep-th/0112258.

[13] M. Berkooz, A. Sever, and A. Shomer, J. High Eenery Phys. **0205** 034, (2002).

[14] P. Minces, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 024027 (2003).

[15] P. Minces, hep-th/0402161.

[16] A. Ishibashi and R.M. Wald, Class. Quantum. Grav. **20**, 3815 (2003).

[17] R.M. Wald, J. Math. Phys. **21**, 2802 (1980).

[18] I. Seggev, gr-qc/0310016.

[19] E. Witten and S.-T. Yau, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **3**, 1635 (1999).

[20] G.J. Galloway, K. Schleich, D.M. Witt, and E. Woolgar, Phys. Lett. **B 505**, 255 (2001).

[21] J. Maldacena and L. Maoz, J. High Energy Phys. **0402**, 053 (2004).

[22] J.M. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 1882 (1980).

[23] H. Kodama and M. Sasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **78**, 1 (1984).

[24] H. Kodama and A. Ishibashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **111**, 29 (2004).

[25] P.B. Gilkey, *The Index Theorem and the Heat Equation*, (Publish or Perish, Boston, 1974).

[26] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*, (Academic Press, New York, 1975).

[27] A. Higuchi, J. Math. Phys, **28**, 1553 (1987).

[28] H. Kodama, A. Ishibashi, and O. Seto, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 064022 (2000).

[29] S. Mukohyama, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 084015 (2000).

[30] H. Kodama and A. Ishibashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **110**, 701 (2003).

[31] I.S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, (Academic Press, London, 1980)

[32] *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, (Dover, New York, 1965) edited by M. Abramowitz, and I.A. Stegun.

[33] S.S. Gubser and I. Mitra, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 064018 (2003).

[34] S.S. Gubser and I.R. Klebanov, Nucle. Phys. B **656**, 23 (2003).

[35] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 023511 (2003).

[36] R.M. Wald, J. Math. Phys, **33**, 248 (1991).

[37] E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2, 505 (1998).

[38] A. Ishibashi and H. Kodama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **110**, 901 (2003).